

PARIS

THE LOUVRE

PITTSBURG STATE UNIV. [KANSAS]



3 5902 00005 6909

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

LIBRARY



708
V28p

18280

WITHDRAWN

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

BY JOHN C. VAN DYKE

	PRICE
I. <i>London</i> —National Gallery, Wallace Collection. With a General Introduction and Bibliography for the Series	<i>net</i> \$1.00
II. <i>Paris</i> —Louvre	<i>net</i> .75
III. <i>Amsterdam</i> —Rijks Museum } <i>The Hague</i> —Royal Gallery } bound together . <i>net</i>	.75
<i>Haarlem</i> —Hals Museum }	
IV. <i>Antwerp</i> —Royal Museum } <i>Brussels</i> —Royal Museum } bound together . <i>net</i>	.75
V. <i>Munich</i> —Old Pinacothek } <i>Frankfort</i> —Staedel Institute } bound together . <i>net</i>	1.00
<i>Cassel</i> —Royal Gallery }	
VI. <i>Berlin</i> —Kaiser-Friedrich } Museum } bound together . <i>net</i>	1.00
<i>Dresden</i> —Royal Gallery }	
VII. <i>Vienna</i> —Imperial Gallery } <i>Budapest</i> —Museum of Fine } bound together . <i>net</i>	1.00
Arts }	
VIII. <i>St. Petersburg</i> —Hermitage	<i>In Press</i>
IX. <i>Venice</i> —Academy } <i>Milan</i> —Brera, Poldi-Pezzoli } bound together . <i>In Press</i>	
X. <i>Florence</i> —Uffizi, Pitti, Academy	<i>In Press</i>
XI. <i>Rome</i> —Vatican, Borghese Gallery	<i>In Press</i>
XII. <i>Madrid</i> —Prado	<i>In Press</i>

THE LOUVRE



Photograph by Braun & Co.

PIERO DELLA FRANCESCA: MADONNA
The Louvre, Paris

NEW GUIDES TO OLD MASTERS

PARIS

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE LOUVRE

BY

JOHN C. VAN DYKE

AUTHOR OF "ART FOR ART'S SAKE," "THE MEANING OF PICTURES,"
"HISTORY OF PAINTING," "OLD DUTCH AND
FLEMISH MASTERS," ETC.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1914

18280

COPYRIGHT, 1914, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Published April, 1914

708



PREFACE TO THE SERIES

THERE are numerous guide-books, catalogues, and histories of the European galleries, but, unfortunately for the gallery visitor, they are either wholly descriptive of obvious facts or they are historical and archæological about matters somewhat removed from art itself. In them the gist of a picture—its value or meaning as art—is usually passed over in silence. It seems that there is some need of a guide that shall say less about the well-worn saints and more about the man behind the paint-brush; that shall deal with pictures from the painter's point of view, rather than that of the ecclesiastic, the archæologist, or the literary romancer; that shall have some sense of proportion in the selection and criticism of pictures; that shall have a critical basis for discrimination between the good and the bad; and that shall, for these reasons, be of service to the travelling public as well as to the art student.

This series of guide-books attempts to meet these requirements. They deal only with the so-called "old masters." When the old masters came upon the scene, flourished, and ceased to exist may be determined by their spirit as well as by their dates. In Italy the tradition of the craft had been established before Giotto and was carried on by Benozzo, Botti-

celli, Raphael, Titian, Tintoretto, even down to Tiepolo in the eighteenth century. But the late men, the men of the Decadence, are not mentioned here because of their exaggerated sentiment, their inferior workmanship—in short, the decay of the tradition of the craft. In France the fifteenth-century primitives are considered, and also the sixteenth-century men, including Claude and Poussin; but the work of the Rigauds, Mignards, Coypels, Watteaus, and Bouchers seems of a distinctly modern spirit and does not belong here. This is equally true of all English painting from Hogarth to the present time. In Spain we stop with the School of Velasquez, in Germany and the Low Countries with the seventeenth-century men. The modern painters, down to the present day, so far as they are found in the public galleries of Europe, will perhaps form a separate guide-book, which by its very limitation to modern painting can be better treated by itself.

Only the best pictures among the old masters are chosen for comment. This does not mean, however, that only the great masterpieces have been considered. There are, for instance, notes upon some three hundred pictures in the Venice Academy, upon five hundred in the Uffizi Gallery, and some six hundred in the Louvre or the National Gallery, London.* Other galleries are treated in the same proportion. But it has not been thought worth while to delve deeply into the paternity of pictures by third-rate primitives or

to give space to mediocre or ruined examples by even celebrated painters. The merits that now exist in a canvas, and can be seen by any intelligent observer, are the features insisted upon herein.

In giving the relative rank of pictures, a system of starring has been followed.

Mention without a star indicates a picture of merit, otherwise it would not have been selected from the given collection at all.

One star (*) means a picture of more than average importance, whether it be by a great or by a mediocre painter.

Two stars (**) indicates a work of high rank as art, quite regardless of its painter's name, and may be given to a picture attributed to a school or by a painter unknown.

Three stars (***) signifies a great masterpiece.

The length of each note and its general tenor will in most cases suggest the relative importance of the picture.

Catalogues of the galleries should be used in connection with these guide-books, for they contain much information not repeated here. The gallery catalogues are usually arranged alphabetically under the painters' names, although there are some of them that make reference by school, or room, or number, according to the hanging of the pictures in the gallery. But the place where the picture may be hung is constantly shifting; its number, too, may be subject to alteration with each new edition of the catalogue; but its painter's

name is perhaps less liable to change. An arrangement, therefore, by the painters' names placed alphabetically has been necessarily adopted in these guide-books. Usually the prefixes "de," "di," "van," and "von" have been disregarded in the arrangement of the names. And usually, also, the more familiar name of the artist is used—that is, Botticelli, not Filipepi; Correggio, not Allegri; Tintoretto, not Robusti. In practical use the student can ascertain from the picture-frame the name of the painter and turn to it alphabetically in this guide-book. In case the name has been recently changed, he can take the number from the frame and, by turning to the numerical index at the end of each volume, can ascertain the former name and thus the alphabetical place of the note about that particular picture.

The picture appears under the name or attribution given in the catalogue. If there is no catalogue, then the name on the frame is taken. But that does not necessarily mean that the name or attribution is accepted in the notes. Differences of view are given very frequently. It is important that we should know the painter of the picture before us. The question of attribution is very much in the air to-day, and considerable space is devoted to it not only in the General Introduction but in the notes themselves. Occasionally, however, the whole question of authorship is passed over in favour of the beauty of the picture itself. It is always the art of the picture we are seeking, more than its name, or pedigree, or commercial value.

Conciseness herein has been a necessity. These notes are suggestions for study or thought rather than complete statements about the pictures. Even the matter of an attribution is often dismissed in a sentence though it may have been thought over for weeks. If the student would go to the bottom of things he must read further and do some investigating on his own account. The lives of the painters, the history of the schools, the opinions of the connoisseurs may be read elsewhere. A bibliography, in the London volume, will suggest the best among the available books in both history and criticism.

The proper test of a guide-book is its use. These notes were written in the galleries and before the pictures. I have not trusted my memory about them, nor shall I trust the memory of that man who, from his easy chair, declares he knows the pictures by heart. The opinions and conclusions herein have not been lightly arrived at. Indeed, they are the result of more than thirty years' study of the European galleries. That they are often diametrically opposed to current views and beliefs should not be cause for dismissing them from consideration. Examine the pictures, guide-book in hand. That is the test to which I submit and which I exact.

• Yet with this insistence made, one must still feel apologetic or at least sceptical about results. However accurate one would be as to fact, it is obviously impossible to handle so many titles, names, and numbers

without an occasional failure of the eye or a slip of the pen; and however frankly fair in criticism one may fancy himself, it is again impossible to formulate judgments on, say, ten thousand pictures without here and there committing blunders. These difficulties may be obviated in future editions. If opinions herein are found to be wrong, they will be edited out of the work just as quickly as errors of fact. The reach is toward a reliable guide though the grasp may fall short of full attainment.

It remains to be said that I am indebted to Mr. and Mrs. George B. McClellan for helpful suggestions regarding this series, and to Mr. Sydney Philip Noe not only for good counsel but for practical assistance in copying manuscript and reading proof.

JOHN C. VAN DYKE.

RUTGERS COLLEGE, 1914.

THE LOUVRE

NOTE ON THE LOUVRE

ALL told, the Louvre is the largest collection of pictures in Europe and perhaps the most famous. It has been in process of accumulation for several centuries, and the process is going on to-day with no whit of energy abated. Francis I furnished the original impulse, for his private collection of nearly two hundred pictures—most of them Italian—formed the nucleus. The royal collections were greatly enlarged by Louis XIV, and he it was who first placed the pictures in the old palace of the Louvre. They did not stay there long, however, but were taken to Versailles, to Fontainebleau, and later to the Palace of the Luxembourg. The growth was continued by additions of such collections as those of Cardinal Mazarin and Jabach the banker. In 1710 there were over twenty-four hundred pictures belonging to the crown.

When Napoleon came into power the pictures were finally installed in the Louvre and enormous accumulations of art—taken as the plunder of war from Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands—were added. At one time half the masterpieces of Europe were in Paris, and though most of these works were afterward restored to their owners, there were many that remained

behind, in the Louvre, and are there now. Since Napoleon's time pictures have continued to gravitate to this collection, not only by purchase and donation of single pictures, but by gifts of private collections in bulk. Of recent years the collections of Campana, Sauvageot, Thiers, La Caze, Thomy-Thièry, Chaudard, Moreau have made important additions. The Louvre is now a great national museum, and every Frenchman regards it patriotically and helps it as best he can. To-day it contains over three thousand pictures, a collection which both in quantity and quality gives just cause for national pride.

The glory of the Louvre has been its great masterpieces by famous artists. In order that the extent and beauty of these might be seen, they were brought together in one large, well-lighted room, called the Salon Carré. Some of them still remain there, but the masterpieces of the gallery long ago outgrew the limits of the Salon Carré, and many of them are now to be found scattered throughout the rooms in the schools to which they belong.

With the exception of the Salon Carré and the special collections, like the La Caze, the pictures are arranged by schools as nearly as wall space and circumstance will allow. The Italian takes up greater space than any of the foreign schools. Its representation is excellent. Even in the side room devoted to the Primitives there are examples of the Early Florentines, Umbrians, Sienese that every student must stop and consider—

precious things in fresco and tempera with gilded haloes, embossed backgrounds, and tooled borderings. Under such names as Botticelli and Piero della Francesca there are wonderful panels of the Madonna and Child; on one wall is a masterpiece by Fra Filippo, on the opposite wall a matchless portrait by Pisanello, on the staircase without is a large and fine fresco by Fra Angelico, and near it two famous frescoes by Botticelli.

In the long gallery of the Louvre there appear scores of pictures by the Early Renaissance men, including famous Francias, Costas, Peruginos, Turas, Bianchis. Here the student will find the two most brilliant Mantegnas in existence, besides his celebrated Madonna of the Victory, and the newly acquired St. Sebastian—his most important work aside from his frescoes. Here, too, is the famous Portrait of a Man by Antonello da Messina, with works by Bellini, Carpaccio, Cima, and others of the Venetian School, all of them excellent in quality.

The great Italian masterpieces, however, belong to the High Renaissance and are found either in the long gallery or in the Salon Carré. The Raphaels on the list may be cut down to five, but this still leaves us the Belle Jardinière, the Holy Family of Francis I, and the Castiglione Portrait—all in the Salon Carré. The representation of Leonardo da Vinci is more amazing, for it includes almost everything of his that is finished or not in ruins—the Mona Lisa, the Madonna and St. Anne, the Madonna of the Rocks. These three

works are not only famous and priceless but indispensably important to the student of art history. As pure art they are not more wonderful than the famous Concert by Giorgione, the rich Marriage of St. Catherine, and the Antiope, by Correggio, the gorgeous Marriage in Cana, by Paolo Veronese, the majestic Entombment, by Titian, hanging near them. They are all artistic gems of purest ray, and are texts for prolonged study. They grow more wonderful each time one sees them.

When one has worked through the rows of Titians, Palmas, Veroneses, Lottos, in the long gallery, he comes to the Spanish School. Here the representation is less complete. There are Murillos, Riberas, Herreras, Il Grecos, Goyas, and one most lovely Velasquez, the Infanta Margarita (in the Salon Carré), but the Spanish School is a little weak. So too the German, though here, again, there are glorious portraits by Holbein of Erasmus, More, and others, and one lovely picture of a little girl by Cranach. The Flemish masters follow with famous portraits of Richardot, Charles I, and others by Van Dyck—in many respects the Charles I is his masterpiece—a number of pictures by Jordaens, and a wide range of superb canvases by Rubens, culminating in a far room entirely devoted to his Medici pictures.

The Dutch School starts with many portraits put down to Hals and Rembrandt, upon which the notes herein comment at some length. In the side cabinets the lesser Dutchmen, Terborch, De Hooch, Metsu,

Steen, Dou, Brouwer are seen to advantage. Here, too, are cabinets devoted to the Dutch and Flemish Primitives—the Van Eycks, Davids, Van der Weydens. The unique collection of the gallery is that of the French Primitives in two or three rooms by themselves. This offers the student a rare opportunity to see the beginnings of French painting. There is no such collection elsewhere. Here, in the Louvre, one can see all French art better represented than in any other European gallery. The modern men are not dealt with in these notes, but the student will not, of course, pass them by.

The galleries and corridors are rather badly lighted and on dark days it is impossible to see the pictures properly. Moreover, there is some bad hanging—something not always to be avoided. Many pictures in the long gallery suffer from want of proper distance to see them or are placed so high that they catch reflections and lights from above, and are rendered meaningless. Of course this does not apply to the large and more spacious Salon Carré, nor to the famous Rubens room which holds the series of Medici pictures. After suffering distortion (and consequent abuse) in the long narrow thoroughfare of the Louvre for many years, these pictures are now shown adequately in a room by themselves. The general look of that room offers weighty argument for the decorative in art. It is a magnificent effect that the Rubens-haters might study with profit.

The direction of the Louvre has not published an

official catalogue in thirty years. The less said about the semiofficial La Fenestre catalogue the better. It is neither complete nor critical, it is badly printed and illustrated, and is expensive into the bargain. Unfortunately it happens to be the only one offered the visitor, and we are obliged to follow it. A much better catalogue by Seymour de Ricci and Joseph Reinach (again unofficial) is being issued. Recent acquisitions are not usually numbered or catalogued for months after their arrival. They are marked in these notes n. n. (no number). Cheap photographic reproductions of the Louvre pictures are to be had in the shops in the Rue de Seine and elsewhere.

Other collections of old masters in Paris, aside from private holding, are not very important. There are a few pictures at the Musée de Cluny, the Musée Dutuit, the Bibliothèque Nationale (miniatures and illuminations), which the student with plenty of time should see. Outside of Paris there is little at Versailles or Fontainebleau, but at Chantilly there is the Musée Condé, containing the pictures collected by the late Duc d'Aumale, that should be seen.

THE LOUVRE

1114. **Albertinelli, Mariotto.** *The Virgin and Child with St. Jerome.* A pyramidal composition after the style of his colleague and fellow worker, Fra Bartolommeo. The draperies are not so full and free in their flow, however, as with Fra Bartolommeo, as note in the saint at left—evidently the work of another painter than either Bartolommeo or Albertinelli. The landscape is interesting in its trees with their spread lace-work foliage at the left. The colour is only so-so. The whole picture is a little puzzling, perhaps because it is a workshop affair in which several painters have had a hand.
1115. ——— *Christ Appearing to the Magdalen.* With a beseeching look in the Magdalen quite pathetic. The landscape is noticeable for its very light tone, and that, with the very broad draperies, points rather to Fra Bartolommeo than to Albertinelli as the painter. See the Fra Bartolommeo in the National Gallery, London (No. 1694), for a similar effect of light and landscape. A handsome little picture in its lines of drapery and its rich colour—things that again point to Fra Bartolommeo.
1290. **Angelico, Fra.** *Coronation of the Virgin.* Notwithstanding the eulogies of this picture by Vasari and Théophile Gautier, quoted in the catalogue, it is by no means the best, or even a good, Fra Angelico. The picture has suffered in its surface, and is now

either raw, as in the sky and steps, or dull, as in the robes, or unconvincing, as in the flowers and hats. The faces are also wanting in the painter's usual charm of sentiment. The picture was probably worked upon by assistants. The scenes in the predella at the bottom are more interesting and better in colour, especially in the blues. Look at the blue angels, or cherubim, with the Franciscans at the right, and the sky and tower in the last panel at the left. This predella is in better condition than the picture.

1293. — *Martyrdom of St. Cosmo and St. Damian.* This is a part of a predella, and is a much better piece of colour than the large Coronation (No. 1290), but still not in Fra Angelico's best vein. The landscape with the dotted white buildings is broadly true and singularly beautiful. But the painter's small works in the Florence Academy are better than this.

N. N. — *Praying Angel.* Possibly an angel of the Annunciation, with the rest of the panel lost. It is lovely in its fine feeling of purity, both in the angel and in the colour. The neck is long, the wings blue, the robe red. It possibly belongs earlier than Fra Angelico.

1294. — *Crucifixion.* (A fresco on the landing of the
* Daru staircase.) To those who have not seen the frescoes of Fra Angelico in San Marco, Florence, this will give some idea of his work in that medium. It is impressive in its figures, that stand so well and have some thickness as well as width and height. The drawing leaves something to be desired, as witness the figure of Christ or the hands of those below. The colour has depth and is now

harmonious, whatever it was originally. Notice the blue of the sky and the red robe at right for their colour quality.

1128 } **Ansano di Pietro. *Life of St. Jerome.*** A series
1132 } of panels showing scenes from the life of St. Jerome, given with simplicity and charm, some knowledge of movement, and good colour. In No. 1131, note the little figure of St. Jerome in the sky and the well-drawn black robes; in No. 1129 there is a fine landscape, with hills and fruit-bearing trees; in No. 1128 the angel's wings have been rubbed off. All of the panels look a little modern in their gildings.

1134. **Antonello da Messina. *Portrait of a Man.*** Here
* is Antonello at his best in his half-Flemish half-Italian style. There is infinite detail, even to the scar on the upper lip and the day's growth of beard on the face; but also great bulk and breadth in the head and the face. It is the powerful face of some swashbuckler, with a heavy jaw and a bulldog chin—a man of determination and power. What an eye he has! What a fearless presence! It is comparable in type to Verrocchio's Colleoni, at Venice.

“The ‘Portrait of a Man,’ the record reads,

With Antonello's signature below.

The rest is blank. The man, his name, his deeds,
All died in Venice centuries ago.”

Done with well-nigh perfect drawing and modelling. And with wonderful simplicity. Even colour is almost eliminated in favour of the portrait reality.

2303A. **Bailly, David. *Portrait of a Young Man.*** A good head that emerges out of its black background effectively. The drawing rambles a bit.

1150. **Baroccio, Federico.** *Madonna in Glory.* This painter belongs to the Decadence, but is by no means a decadent in the matter of colour nor in sure, swift handling. He formed himself upon Correggio, and in turn helped form the style of so great a man as Rubens. As noted elsewhere, Rubens probably got something of his surface brilliancy, his flesh notes, and his fluid handling from Baroccio. The picture has been too much cleaned and repainted.
1149. ——— *The Circumcision.* A brighter Baroccio than No. 1150. It shows his fed-on-roses flesh better. Notice the colour and handling of the yellow and red robes. It is not a bad picture and indicates that the skill of the Italians endured after their taste had fled.
1151. **Bartolo di Fredi.** *Presentation in the Temple.* It has the rich, decorative effect that comes from using gold patterns with colour. Notice the robes, the borders, and the haloes. The drawing is, of course, not that of the Renaissance, but it is complete for its time. An attempt to show church architecture as an envelope for the figures, but not too successful.
1153. **Bartolommeo, Fra.** *The Annunciation.* A
* novel treatment of the Annunciation, with the flying angel and dove at the top of the canvas and saints below grouped on either side. It is rich in greens, oranges, and reds, and is quite as effective in its shadows and atmosphere as in its colour. The robes are beautifully drawn and the kneeling figures are not only fine as art but also fine in religious feeling. An excellent small example of the painter. It is, unfortunately, somewhat injured.

1154. — *Madonna Enthroned*. A large picture with a predominance of blue-green colouring which the brighter reds and oranges fail to warm or temper. The composition was a favourite one with the painter — a pyramidal pattern with supporting saints on either side and a crescent of angels at the top. The drawing is excellent all through and the drapery very well handled. Notice how the green dress of the saint at the right falls from the waist across the knees. And how beautiful are the folds in the light dress of the woman kneeling at the left! What robust characters in the men! What graceful lines in the rainbow-winged cherubs at the top! A fine picture, but it has neither the fineness nor the quality in colour, shadow, and atmosphere of the smaller No. 1153 hanging next it.

N. N. **Bellegambe, Jean.** (Attributed.) *St. Adrien*. A full-length figure of the saint standing, given with much dignity and grace. Carefully drawn and very effective, but without the minutiae of the early Flemish painters. Notice the free drawing and painting of the decorative pattern on the armour as well as in the background figures and houses. An excellent work with much beauty of style about it. The attribution is merely a guess.

1156. **Bellini, Gentile.** *Portrait of Two Men*. It is similar to the picture No. 12 in the Berlin Gallery, there put down to Giovanni Bellini's School. This work is not by Gentile, but by some one close to the young Cariani, as Crowe and Cavalcaselle surmised some years ago. Much cleaned.

1157. **Bellini, Gentile** (School of). *Reception of a Venetian Ambassador at Cairo*. A repainted picture, but interesting still as showing what the early

Venetians knew about sunlight, sky, and air, as also for costumes and architecture. It is rather coarsely done.

1158. **Bellini, Giovanni.** *Madonna with St. Peter and St. Sebastian.* A smooth and rather attractive work, in the style of Bellini, but hardly by his hand. The suggestion, made years ago by Morelli, that it was by Bellini's Ravennese imitator Rondinelli, is still pertinent, though a study of Rondinelli's other work hardly lends confirmation. The Madonna is a pleasing type as is also the girlish St. Sebastian. The colour is harmonious and the drawing not bad.

1158A. — *Portrait of a Man.* A very noble portrait showing both strength and beauty. It is a little sharp in the outlines, but exceedingly well drawn in the face. It is also fine in colouring. The winning feature of it is its strong characterisation, its frankness of statement, its evident honesty. It is quite different from the portrait of the Doge Lore-dano, being more mature-looking, which excites the suspicion that perhaps it is by a later man than Bellini; but one cannot be certain about that.

N. N. — *The Saviour Blessing.* This is the risen Saviour, the Christ of the tomb, and for that reason, probably, he is portrayed in white with pallid flesh, the hands, brows, and side marked with blood. It is a very pathetic figure, showing suffering, humiliation, attenuation. The hands are just as frail as the body, and the face carries out the same idea of a presence that is more spiritual than corporeal. Even the landscape and the sky are more or less ghostlike, unearthly, not sun-illuminated. The white robe that clings to the shrunken figure,

the thin hand that clasps the book, the hand raised in blessing, the sad eyes, the half-parted lips, are all a part of the tragic tale told with great feeling, belief, earnestness, truth. Before such a picture one hardly wishes to think of technique or decoration. And yet how inevitably the instinct of the painter placed that fine white against the blue and edged it with dull gold! How beautiful the picture is in colour, and how appropriate that beauty of colour is to the theme portrayed! How tenderly he has drawn the eyes and mouth and painted the matted hair! How beautifully he touched the head with radiating lines of gold! It is a beautiful Bellini—even a great one—and comparable in its intensity of feeling to the fine *Pietà* at the Brera, Milan (No. 214), and the *Blood of the Redeemer* in the London National Gallery (No. 1233). All three pictures have the same tragic quality. A recent acquisition by the Louvre.

1319. **Benozzo Gozzoli. *Triumph of St. Thomas Aquinas*.** A scattered composition that is more of a map or diagram than a picture, but with some strong heads and faces in it and some good drawing and colouring. Notice the heads and robes in the groups at bottom where the drapery is very uneasy and the floor cloth waves in folds. Attractive evangelists are at the top.
1320. ———. (Attributed.) ***Madonna, Child, and Saints*.** It has much of Fra Angelico's influence about it and is some sort of a school piece emanating from him. It is prosaic and lacks spirit besides being a little summary in drawing. The figures on the frame and the predella are the most interesting parts of the altar-piece, but even this work (as in the

central panel) is too poor in drawing for either Fra Angelico or Benozzo. Look at the hands.

1167. **Bianchi, Francesco.** *Madonna and Child with Saints.* A fine altar-piece, possibly by some Ferrarese painter whose name is unknown to history. It is nearer to the altar-piece by Ercole Grandi (No. 1119) in the National Gallery, London, than to any other picture. It also shows the influence of Francia. It is cold in the blues and the faces have been cleaned until they look flat and wooden, but there is still simple composition and good sentiment. The saints are fine characters, the architecture and landscape are excellent, and the little angels playing on instruments at the foot are quite charming. The white medallion on the base of the throne is said to be a peculiar Ferrarese ear-mark, but you will see it in the Albertinelli (No. 1114) hanging near at hand.
2330. **Bol, Ferdinand.** *Portrait of a Mathematician.* A good portrait with well-drawn forehead, eyes, mouth, and cheeks. The surface has been cleaned but the drawing still holds fairly well.
2328. — *Philosopher in Meditation.* A picture not showing Bol at his best, but curious because the philosopher is the same model as in the Bol picture (No. 48) in the Brussels Gallery and identical with the man called Rembrandt's brother in a picture by Rembrandt at The Hague (No. 560). It is odd that the alleged Rembrandt pictures should need to borrow Bol's models.
1668. **Bolognese School.** *Judgment of Paris.* Rather hard in drawing (notice the hands) but with a boyish immaturity and sincerity that is amusing. The landscape is as crude as the figures.

1169. **Boltraffio, Giovanni Antonio.** *The Virgin of the Casio Family.* A large and rather crudely drawn picture with excellent donors at right and left and a poor angel in the sky that seems the afterthought of some cleaning-room artist. The Child, the Madonna, the saint are all somewhat wooden—that is, hard in surface.
1171. **Bonifazio dei Pitati.** *Holy Family.* With a fine landscape and a rich colour effect. It is a half-arch gathering of gaily dressed figures under a tree and columns, with a bright sky on either side.
1178. **Bordone, Paris.** *Vertumnus and Pomona.* It is hard in drawing and dry in handling. Look at the ropy hair and the poor, raspberry-coloured gown. It is not Bordone at his best.
1179. — *Portrait of a Man.* A dark but very acceptable portrait, done with much elegance of materials in costume, column, and curtain. How well the mouth and eyes are drawn! And the hands, too, are well done. The red patches of flesh colour, peculiar to Bordone, are here.
1181. **Borgognone, Il (Ambrogio Fossano).** *Presentation in the Temple.* In Borgognone's usual vein, with draperies at right angles as regards their lines (see the blue robe of the Madonna) and something of the sentiment and the sootiness of shadow that are associated with the Milanese School. Somewhat hurt, but still decorative in the gilded architecture and the fruit.
- 1182 } — *St. Peter and St. Augustine with Donors.*
 1182A } Two wings of an altar-piece with saints and donors. The portraits of the kneeling donors are

very good, though lead-hued in the flesh, as is usual with Borgognone.

1295. **Botticelli, Sandro.** *Madonna of the Magnificat.* Said to be a replica of the one in the Uffizi (No. 1267 bis). It is probably a copy, and not a very good one at that.

1296. **—***Madonna, Christ, and St. John.* There are various reasons for supposing it is not by Botticelli, but there is little question about its being a picture of great charm and beauty. It can get along without a name. In refined sensitiveness of feeling it is wonderful. All three figures are a little abnormal in their intensity. The drawing is hurt by cleaning but is still excellent, and the colour is perfect in serenity and charm. What beautiful haloes and what lovely flowers! The drawing of the tree trunks and foliage is worthy of note. There is something in the grey trunks against the sky that suggests Amico di Sandro, as also in the flowers, the drawing of the noses, the eyes, the mouths; but there are other parts of it that suggest the style of Fra Filippo with Botticelli's colour. A beautiful picture whoever did it. The same painter did the picture No. 1303 in the Uffizi, there ascribed to Botticelli.

1297. **—***Giovanni Tornabuoni and the Graces.* A broken fragment of fresco (on the Daru staircase) which has still great beauty about it. The lovely types with wistful faces, the appealing, if mannered, hands, and the fluttering draperies are all moving forward to meet the chief figure at the right. The action is rather well given notwithstanding the sharp drawing. The colour is still beautiful although much of it has gone—especially in the gold-

patterned and reddish robe in the centre. The outlines are wonderful in their rhythmic flow, repeating and supplementing or contrasting with one another. Look at the outlines of the chins; how arbitrary, yet how beautiful as pure line they are!

1298. **Botticelli, School of. *Lorenzo Tornabuoni and the Liberal Arts*.** A companion piece to No. 1297 and from the same source (the Villa Lemmi, near Florence), but the catalogue seems to intimate that it is not entirely by Botticelli. There is no doubt he inspired it, designed it, and himself did the figure of Lorenzo at the left and the seated figure at the right; but in some of the other figures the faces seem prettier and the robes smoother than is usual with Botticelli. The colour, too, seems not so delicate as in No. 1297 though excellent in itself. Perhaps the stronger notes of colour here are due to less abrasion or fading of hues. In any event, there is no certainty that Botticelli did not do the whole work. The variation from No. 1297 is too slight to draw conclusions from with any assurance.

- 1300A. — ***Madonna and Child*.** The attribution is questioned by many critics. Mr. Berenson thinks it is a copy by Jacopo del Sellajo of a lost original by Amico di Sandro. This, involving as it does no less than five different hypotheses (1, a copy; 2, by Jacopo; 3, of an original; 4, lost; 5, by Amico, who is a figment of Mr. Berenson's imagination), may be thought rather far-fetched. But the drawing is practically the same as in No. 1663, which Mr. Berenson also gives to Amico di Sandro. So he is consistent in his imaginings. It is a good picture—as good in its sky, trees, flowers,

and the two fine heads in the background as some Botticellis. The Child is the same type as in the Magnificat here (No. 1295). By the same hand is a Madonna at Chantilly put down to Filippo Lippi. The picture has been overcleaned but still has beauty of colour.

2336. **Brekelenkam, Quieringh Gerritz.** *Monk Writing.* To be compared (in connection with the work of Gerard Dou, whom he followed) with the picture by Rembrandt of a Hermit Reading (No. 2541A), to ascertain, if possible, the painter of the latter picture. Otherwise the picture is of no great importance.
1911. **Bril, Paul.** *Pan and Syrinx.* Rather fine in the sky and distance if minute and finical in the foreground. The attribution is not too solidly based. See also No. 1910 hanging near by.
1184. **Bronzino, Angelo.** *Portrait of a Sculptor.* A rather hard figure that unhappily stands out from the air of the room at the back. The head and the face are hard, too, and the statuette is not very well held. The colour is sombre. Bronzino did better things than this.
1916. **Brouwer, Adriaen.** *The Smoker.* A piece of
* pure painter's work which shows how sure Brouwer was in the handling of paint. See how he has dragged it around the nose, and on the cheek, and rubbed it in the smoke. The same smoker appears in a picture attributed to Frans Hals the Younger in the Dresden Gallery (No. 1406). See also the good Brouwers here (Nos. 1915 and 1913).
1925. **Brueghel, Jan the Elder (Velvet).** *The Bridge of Talavera.* A landscape with small figures in the

foreground. Done with much feeling for the picturesque and with good colour results. See also No. 1926.

1919 } ——— *Paradise and The Air*. With much good
1920 } painting but some spottiness in the small objects.
The composition is rather scattered.

1917. ^{*} **Brueghel, Peter the Elder (Peasant). *The Beggars*.** What a piece of fresh painting and delightful colour! And what drawing! There are few Netherland pictures in the Louvre that will go beyond it. Never mind the disagreeable subject; look at the workmanship—the handling. The same hand did the Peasant Wedding (No. 717) at Vienna. The Brueghels are confused with one another. See the Vienna notes upon them.

1917A. ——— *The Parable of the Blind*. It is probably a copy of Peasant Brueghel by his son, but it is a decent piece of painting nevertheless. The figures and the clothing are well handled. It is technical skill with some distinction even in the copyist. With a landscape that is not too well done in the trees.

N. N. **Bruyn, Barthel. *Portraits of Donors*.** Two panels of some excellence, recently acquired by the Louvre. Good both as portraiture and as decorative art, though a little raw in the interiors and coats of arms. They are probably the wings of an altar-piece. In Room XV.

1185. **Calcar (Johann von Calcker). *Portrait of a Man*.** A well-executed picture that for some reason fails to impress one as perhaps it should. Possibly there is too much clever painting in costume and not enough strength of impression in the sitter.

Notice how well the hands are done. The head also is rightly drawn and there is atmospheric setting to the picture. But we pass it by without any awakened enthusiasm. Attributed to Calcar, an imitator of Titian, but who knows much about Calcar or his work? And where are the other pictures he might have painted? Are they masquerading as Titians and Pordenones in European collections?

1203. **Canaletto, Giovanni Antonio.** *The Salute at Entrance of Grand Canal.* A large and rather fine Canaletto, with much truth and beauty in the buildings as well as in the sky, water, shipping, and figures. This is the painter at his best, with artistic feeling shown even in such small things as the black gondolas in the middle distance, or the coloured groups at the right. The sky lofty, with cumulus clouds.
1211. **Carpaccio, Vittore.** *St. Stephen Preaching in Jerusalem.* Not a remarkable Carpaccio, compared with his pictures in Venice, but a picture with good colour effects got from rich robes, from a naïve, ill-drawn group of figures in the foreground, and from architecture at the back. Carpaccio always pleases by his frank, almost boyish way of seeing and doing. Notice the seated figures in front and the wandering folk in pretty garments at the back. And at the left the intent, listening quality of the large figure with hands clasped behind him. The drawing in the figures is rather bad and the landscape is crude. Possibly Carpaccio was not entirely responsible for this. There is some school work in it.
- 1252A. **Catena, Vincenzo.** *Portrait of a Man.* A minutely drawn head (with a sharp nose and pursed

mouth) of some Venetian of rank. An early portrait, and rather good without being profound. The attribution is not so certain as it seems. Catena was usually not so small in his drawing.

1259. **Cima, Giovanni Batista.** *The Virgin and Child.*

**

One of the best of all the Cimas in its completeness, its oneness of effect, its good colour, and its equally good landscape with its feeling for distance and space. To the landscape and sky one returns with delight. They are serene, peaceful, charming. The figures are honest with no excess of sentiment, they are accurately drawn and handsomely robed, and they hold their place in the picture without effort or strain. The drawing is sharp (notably in the hands and edges of the drapery) but one does not feel it uncomfortably. And what colour in the green water, supplementing the green of the robes, and varying the green of the uplands! The baldacchino—well, the baldacchino is not the best part of the picture.

1260. **Cimabue, Giovanni.** *Madonna and Angels.*

The attribution is disputed, but there is no doubt about this picture being in the Cimabue style. It shows the growth up and out of the Byzantine manner, which, however, is still apparent in the green shadows of the flesh, the long face and nose, the thin, slit-like eyes, the long fingers, the sharply lined and folded drapery. The whole group of the figures with the chair does not recede but slips down and almost out of the picture. The angels are supposed to be surrounding and enclosing the chair, but in reality they stand one upon another. There is no perspective, no third dimension, no air, no light. The angel heads, where they are

turned aside, show a very slight study of nature, or rather a looking away for a moment from the Byzantine manikin, which had been copied for years. The colour is primitive but probably now dulled somewhat.

315. **Claude Lorraine. *David and Samuel*.** A warm Claude, almost Turneresque in tone, with some good air and sky. A good landscape for all its academic, stilted quality.
312. ——— ***Village Holiday*.** A picture that Turner must have admired, if he ever saw it. In the same vein as No. 315 and of much beauty in its air, sky, and distance.
311. ——— ***Campo Vaccino, Rome*.** Full of light and air with a fine colour harmony. Claude seems here to get more fine effect out of buildings than he does out of trees or hills.
316. ——— ***Ulysses Restores Chryseis to Her Father*.** A seaport with a yellow sky and beetling architecture. Quite in the vein of work afterward followed with greater artistic effect by Turner. See also No. 314.
2738. **Cleve, Juste van der Beke, van (Master of the Death of the Virgin). *Deposition*.** A picture in three compartments with a St. Francis above and a Last Supper below. The Supper is perhaps the best part of it, with its good drawing and warm colour. The central panel is a little dull although it has some good feeling. It was done by a different hand from the one that did the top and bottom panels. Possibly Cleve did it. The figure of the Magdalen with outspread hands is the same type that appears in the picture No. 537 in the Brussels

Gallery, there ascribed to Claeszoon (Le Maître d'Oultremont). See note under Munich Gallery picture by Cleve.

- 2738A. Cleve, School of. *A Monk Offering His Heart to Christ*. The picture comes nearer to the School of Gerard David or Patinir than Juste van Cleve. The Madonna and Child here are brighter-hued than a David or Patinir and more like the picture at Brussels (No. 349) also put down as by Cleve. But the landscape points directly to Patinir.
126. Clouet, Jean (called Jannet). *Portrait of Francis I*. Of the same flattened character in face and figure as No. 1007 but not by the same painter. The hands here are fairly well drawn, the dress is regal in its magnificence, the background is a rich red pattern. The face and the neck have been too much cleaned. Another Francis I (No. 127) here shown may be the original, and this picture a repetition of it on a larger scale by some one of the school.
128. Clouet, François. *Portrait of Charles IX*. A
 * small full-length with much beauty of detail, colour, and character. It is a marvel of exact drawing and is almost certainly by the hand of the leader in this Clouet portraiture, whoever he may be.
130. — *Portrait of Elizabeth of Austria*. Smooth in
 * the surfaces, transparent in the glazes, fine in the colour, and much ornamented in the costume. What a wonderful costume! The hands are little more than suggested as colour. It is a lovely portrait of a proud and handsome woman. One of the best portraits in this sixteenth-century French room. Probably by the painter of No. 128.

129. ——— *Portrait of Henri II.* It may not be by the painter of No. 128, but in any event it is a good portrait. How well the figure stands! And how fine the type, the costume, and the suggested envelope of air!
- * 127A. ——— *Portrait of Pierre Outhe.* A portrait of much force with a strong Clouet tang about it. It is pretty certainly his work. Signed 1562, which helps corroborate its internal evidence. An excellent portrait though now a little stained and cleaned.
- 133A } *Clouet of Navarre. Portraits of Louis de Saint-*
 134 } *Gelais and The Duchesse de Roanmois.* Smooth in the surfaces and rather pretty portraits. Superficially judged, they seem to be near the painter of No. 128, but they are put down to Clouet of Navarre, a supposed brother of Jean Clouet, who was the father of François Clouet. The Clouets and their works need illumination before any one can pronounce on their pictures with certainty. In the meantime we may admire the pictures without fear, for they are very good.
2737. *Cologne, School of. Deposition.* A fine altar-piece (the centre of a triptych, the wings having disappeared) now much hurt by the bright gilt panels put in at the top. Here is religious feeling, pathos, tragedy—what you will—of a very sincere kind; and with it there is much beauty of detail and splendour of colour. The drawing in the hands is cramped, the drapery mannered in its folds, the action constrained; but in spite of that it is an excellent decorative altar-piece. Notice the beauty of the reds and whites, the rich brocades, the old-gold ground. Various attributed to Lucas
- * 2737.

van Leyden, Metsys, and others, without prejudice to the picture.

2738c } ———*Episodes in the Life of St. Ursula.* How
2738D } very decorative in robes, jewels, gilding, and
architectural framings! Nor are the figures without dignity, standing erect as they do and showing the repeated perpendicular line. They have not the nobility of the Carpaccio figures and yet fall but little short of them. Look at the young king in No. 2738D or St. Ursula in the companion picture.

1117. Correggio, Antonio Allegri da. *Mystic Marriage of St. Catherine.* One of the most beautiful of all the Correggios. The spirit of it is not religious but simply natural. These people are bothered with neither humanism nor ecclesiasticism, with neither history nor philosophy, nor even the humdrum of social existence. They are shepherds in Arcadia, gathered together for a romp and a frolic. Notice the shepherd at the back, with his smile, that seems the key-note to the spirit of the group. The Madonna and Child are just as earthly and human as the shepherd. The St. Catherine seems the only shy and quiet one. How charming she is! The hands—look at the gathering and grouping of the hands as a focal point for the eye. They are the centre of the composition, which is made up of masses of light surrounded by dark. The colour is very lovely, and the drawing very good in a large, comprehensive sense—that is to say, the feeling of bulk and body in the figures is well given, though certain outlines may lack in accuracy. The handling is free for the painter and his time, as one may see in the beautifully painted robes. And what beautiful hair! A superb landscape at the

back. The faces have been too much cleaned and the whole picture has been retouched in places, but beauty is still in it.

1118. — *Antiope*. The figure of Antiope as a central spot of light (with repeated spots of lesser light in the Satyr and the Cupid, and the whole group surrounded by cool darks) is really wonderful. It was the Correggio convention to compose in that way, and the picture as a pattern of light upon dark carries effectively at a distance. But as a representation of reality the form of Antiope is not very convincing. The lines seem awkward, and for a figure supposed to be sleeping, almost impossible. There is a feeling of make-believe about it, as though the model were posing for effective lines. This is also apparent in the Cupid, who is trying to sleep but is wide awake through the discomfort of his position. The drawing of the Cupid is curious, the foreshortening questionable, the body only to be surmised, the knees and feet very good. So, too, with Antiope. The neck and the right shoulder are odd, the nose and the mouth protrusive, the feet and legs well given. The lines of Antiope's figure are repeated in the Satyr (Jupiter) and contrasted in the Cupid, with a resultant strengthening of the Antiope. As colour the picture is cool—too much so, perhaps. The handling cannot be judged because of much cleaning and repainting, from which the picture has suffered. The landscape suggestion at the right is excellent. It is a masterpiece, but the present generation does not rave over it as did Thomas Couture and his contemporaries. What is worse, it does not even look at it—which is something of a pity.

1261. **Costa, Lorenzo.** *Court of Isabella d'Este.* This picture is less interesting in its figures than in its landscape—something that Francia and Costa developed to a remarkable degree at Bologna. Their work there in the St. Cecilia Chapel is still bearing witness to their extraordinary early success. The landscape should be compared with the Bologna frescoes. The light here is dull and somewhat cold; but what a radical departure in trees, mountains, water, sky, air from the work of, say, Perugino! The landscape is a lovely ground upon which the small figures are little more than graceful, agreeable spots of colour. The half-nude figure with the bow, at the right, should be compared with the Costa full-length nude at Budapest (No. 124). This landscape was done for the same room in the Mantuan palace of Isabella d'Este as No. 1567, by Perugino, in this gallery.

N. N. **Coter, Colin de.** *The Trinity.* This picture is related to what is now called the "School of Robert Campin," or the Master of Flémalle. Compare it with the Frankfort picture (No. 102-104) by the Master of Flémalle, or two panels in the Hermitage (Nos. 447 and 448) put down to the School of Van der Weyden. They are all closely allied. This Louvre picture, though stringy and angular, is well done.

2703. **Cranach the Elder, Lucas.** *Venus.* One of the familiar figures that Cranach drew a number of times. As pure outline drawing it is attractive. Notice the town under the brow of the mountain with its reflection in the pretty little lake.

2703A. — *Portrait of a Man.* In Cranach's style, and a fairly good work. The hands are cramped, the

face a little hot in colour, the figure very flat. There are suggestions of the younger Cranach about it, especially in the ill-drawn hands and the pinched face.

2705. ——— *Portrait of a Man*. The miniature-like work in the drawing of the hair, beard, and fur collar would suggest an early example of Cranach. The Germanic type is given with that truth which lacks the third dimension. It has no depth nor thickness. Notice the flatness of the hat and figure. The colour is agreeable. Probably by the elder Cranach. See also No. 2704.

N. N. * ——— *Portrait of a Young Girl*. A beautiful picture. It is really little more than black and white, but it owes much of its beauty to the fine quality of the blacks and their relation to the whites. A naïve type. This is Cranach at his best. Look at the beautifully drawn little hands and the lovely painting of the hair.

1263. *Credi, Lorenzo di. Madonna and Child with Saints*. Quite in the style of Lorenzo, with his sentiment and types—both of them a little weak. The robes are good and the architecture interesting, but the colour is forbidding and the regularity of the work is prosaic. Vasari says it was “the best work Lorenzo ever made,” but then Vasari was given to the superlative.

1264. ——— *Christ and the Magdalen*. A slight but rather attractive picture with good draperies and picturesque trees. Another picture like it is in the Uffizi. This one has more colour in the flesh and robes than usual and is not so artificial in feeling as the average Lorenzo.

2343. **Cuyp, Aelbert. *Riding Out.*** A better picture than No. 2342, with good horses and riders and a fine landscape. The sky and clouds should be noticed for their excellence. How well the men sit their horses, and what fine types they are!
2342. ——— ***Starting for a Ride.*** With good figures, costumes, horses, and landscape. A modified diagonal composition which Cuyp possibly got from some one such as Van Goyen. There is some air in the picture, though most of it has been rubbed out by cleaning.
2341. ——— ***Landscape.*** A fine sky with rising, cumulus clouds and good atmosphere between the foreground and the distant city. Notice the bulk and weight of the cow lying down. There is a yellow sunset, and at the back a Dutch city, picturesquely given.
2344. ——— ***Portraits of Children.*** The painting is smooth but effective, the colour yellowish but agreeable, the drawing large and quite right. It is perhaps prettified in its types and lacks in strong characterisation.
1957. **David, Gerard. *Marriage in Cana.*** A picture
* that has been attributed to almost every painter of the early Flemish School but is still looking for its master. Mr. Weale thinks it was finished by Isenbrandt, which may be true, but the picture is too good for various hands to have painted upon it. The draperies are large and full, the colour clear, the architecture in the distance quite true. Look at the figure in red at the table and the flowers back of her; at the still-life, the robes. The picture is hardly a mixture. Besides, what does Mr.

Weale or any one else know about the work of Isenbrandt? He is only a name. This work comes very close to David as we now know him.

2348. **Dou, Gerard.** *The Dropsical Woman.* A glassy, enamelled Dou in his popular style, with much detail. Poor in colour and cold in light. And it was sold in the eighteenth century for 30,000 florins! There are fashions in art shops as elsewhere.
1985. **Dyck, Anthony van.** *Portrait of Jean Grusset*
 ** *Richardot.* A portrait of commanding excellence and superb aplomb. It is certainty itself in the fine head of the man with its noble forehead and beautifully drawn eyes, well-modelled nose, and suggested mouth. How very serene and well poised the man appears! The landscape back of him is excellent—almost beyond Van Dyck's best. The boy may have been an afterthought. He does not fit in the picture any too well. His forehead is problematical, while the eyes are rather ill drawn. Some discrepancy in dates leads the catalogue to doubt whether Van Dyck did the picture, but the dates are more likely to be wrong than the picture. It is in Van Dyck's manner, particularly in the man's forehead, eyes, nose, and cheeks.
1983. ——— *Portrait of the Artist.* By no means his best work. It is carelessly done (see the moustache and mouth), and has been cleaned and somewhat repainted. There is a certain air of romance, bravado, devil-may-care about it, but as art it is not a great effort.
1972. ——— *Portrait of François de Moncade.* With some heat in the face and curious drawing in the left eye, but nevertheless a considerable portrait. It

is done in the painter's hasty manner. He executed several portraits of this man. No. 1971 in this gallery shows him on horseback—a larger but less effective picture.

1975. ———*Portrait of the Duke of Richmond.* There is little about it to indicate Van Dyck's brush. Look at the clumsy drawing of the eyes and eyelids, the stuck-on nose, the tight little mouth, and the thoroughly commonplace painting of the hair, the shirt, and the breeches.

1974. ———*Portrait of a Lady and Her Daughter.* In the painter's courtly style, done with care, and with good effect. The face of the lady is beautifully drawn, as are also the aristocratic hands. What an attractive personality! The little child, more commonplace in colouring, hardly belongs to so dignified a composition, but is not obtrusive. The child's face is more freely done than the lady's. The picture is well held together. Notice the painting of the black dress near the knees, and the right placing of the golden curtain back of the lady's head. A fine Van Dyck, done with grace as well as truth, nobility of mien and carriage as well as life.

1976. ———*Portrait of a Man.* A bit careless in the right eye and the left wrist, but it has presence about it, and some painter's enthusiasm in the doing of it. Also there is some richness of colour. The handling is still apparent.

1967. ———*Portrait of Charles I.* The painter has excelled this in simple portraiture, but as a portrait and picture combined this group is perhaps his masterpiece. It is fine in composition, and the

landscape at the back is beyond reproach as a pattern. Charles himself is well drawn, and stands well without much pose or pretence or consciousness. He is very well painted. Notice how deftly the textures are rendered in the silk coat, the red trousers and the buff boots. The equerry (the Duke of Hamilton?) is rightly subordinated and kept down in light, but he, too, is well drawn. Even the horse has come in for better portraiture than Van Dyck usually bestowed on his chargers. The sky and trees should also be noticed, as also the set-in of the figures, and the atmospheric envelope. Aside from its technique, what a noble presence he has given to Charles. He is undersized, to be sure, but every inch a king, standing there without any of the trappings of a throne, dressed as a gentleman merely, and yet dignified, restful, monarch-like. Some there are who see in it a sadness premonitory of the king's fate, and others there be who see the king in a hunting scene, but the painter probably had neither thought in mind. There is told a tale of the picture being cut in two by certain heirs who could not agree that either should have it in its entirety. The line of the cut is still apparent.

1973. ——— *Portrait of a Man and a Child*. It is a blackish affair with considerable pose and affectation about both man and child. Look at the hands with their little oratorical gesture, or the turn of the heads. The child's head seems the better of the two. But neither of them is comparable to the characters in No. 1974.
1977. ——— *Portrait of a Man*. A picture of some distinction without being a masterpiece. It is appar-

ently in fairly good condition. The head is well drawn, the drapery a little full, the whites a bit formal in their arrangement. But it is a good portrait.

1969. ——— *Portraits of the Duke of Bavaria and His Brother.* Not so impressive as it looks at first glance. The cleaning-room processes must have damaged it, and there must always have been too much armour in evidence. The figures are not very well placed on the canvas, but there is some haughtiness about it, some aristocracy of face and hand, superficial though it be.
1971. ——— *Portrait of François de Moncade.* It has been too badly repainted to judge of its merits as painting at the present time. There is grandiloquence about it, and it is one of Van Dyck's best equestrian portraits, but it falls a little short of the mark. In his late style.
1962. ——— *The Virgin and Donors.* A good subject picture, done in Van Dyck's best manner, with a beautiful type for the Madonna, and some charm in the Child. The portraits of the Donors are plain and without pretence, both heads being strong and well done. The colour is, or would be, very good, were it not darkened by the painter's persistent habit of painting flesh over black underbasing. The effect of this shows in the sooty hands of the Madonna, Child, and Donors, and in the discoloured blue robe. But it is a very good piece of work. The influence of Titian is apparent in it. Somewhat retouched and hurt by restorations.
1964. ——— *St. Sebastian.* Not so bad a Van Dyck in either form or colour as some other works here

attributed to him. He was not a success in these subjects, and evidently cared not too much about them. No. 1961 is a poor affair, and the mythological themes (Nos. 1965 and 1966) are too pretty, though they are agreeable in colour.

2364. **Eeckhout, Gerbrandt van den.** *Anne Consecrating Her Son.* A Rembrandtesque picture with dull light and some accent of small high lights in the robes and gold of the chair. Notice the hands, for they are not unlike Rembrandt's except that they are a little finer and not very well drawn. The colour is good and the figures of the woman and child are well given. Notice also that the golden robes are done not unlike those in the Rembrandt, *Woman Bathing* (No. 2549), opposite. The standing figure of the Rabbi in a turban is, perhaps, the same model as the turbaned figure in the *Good Samaritan* by Rembrandt across the gallery (No. 2357). This man's work should be borne in mind when examining the pictures put down to Rembrandt.
1986. **Eyck, Jan van.** *Madonna with the Donor.* In spite of some bombardment from modern criticism, this picture is still attributed to Jan van Eyck, and not to his older brother Hubert. And for the very good reason that no one knows anything positively about Hubert's style, but they do know something about Jan's style. Some might think the picture in the style of Roger van der Weyden or Christus, but it comes near enough to Jan van Eyck. In any event, it is a famous work and has always been considered a marvel in its goldsmith-like workmanship. What superb characterisation in the kneeling donor, supposed to be Chan-

cellor Rollin! It is a fine portrait. The Madonna and Child are quite as fine in their way. The colour is not so noticeable as the detail, in which the eye can wander for a long time, finding new beauties at every turn. Notice the crown, the globe held by the Child, the edge of the Madonna's robe, the architecture, the floor, the flowers. Examine them carefully. And do not overlook the town (supposed to be Lyons), the river, and the distant landscape so serenely beautiful. Perhaps there is too much in the picture. It lacks the simplicity of, say, the Arnolfini portraits in the National Gallery, London (No. 1186). But it is no less a marvel.

1677A } **Ferrarese School. *St. George and St. Apolli-***
 1677B } ***naris.*** Two small figures, beautiful in colour,
 standing with much dignity of presence in archi-
 tectural niches. In the present (1913) arrangement
 on the wall they are difficult to see. They should
 be on a screen where the beauty of the costumes
 and the depth of the colour could be seen.

1285. **Ferrari, Gaudenzio. *St. Paul.*** The figure is somewhat heavy and encumbered with too much beard and drapery. The protruding hands and feet are very well done, and the landscape is unusually good.

2203. **Flemish School (15th Century). *The Dead Christ.*** Strong in its sentiment—even tragic. The figure is angular and stiff, the drawing cramped, the colour excellent. The storm-clouds in the sky are suggestive. The work shows the influence of Van der Weyden in the figures, and yet reminds one of Metsys. The landscape is also like a Metsys.

- 2204A. ——— *Portrait of an Old Man.* A fine head that speaks for itself in both drawing and character. It was at one time thought more German than Flemish, and attributed to Holbein. It is almost good enough for Holbein, though not by him. It is now thought by M. Durand-Gréville to be by Juste van Cleve.
2198. ——— *Pastoral Instruction.* It has good colour about it and some excellent architecture, with much detail of drawing. Once thought to be a Memling, but it has no Memling look. It is something of a puzzle.
2202. ——— *The Annunciation.* The sentiment is pure, the figures simple, the colours rich. It is well drawn and painted. And with considerable certainty of touch, as in the brasses, the jewels, the flowers. Through the window a charming landscape is seen. At one time attributed to Lucas van Leyden and again to Memling. It is a difficult picture to place with any positiveness, but it is probably nearer to the Master of Flémalle than any one else. See the Madrid picture, No. 1514.
- 2738B. ——— *Madonna and Child.* This is a comparatively new acquisition and unfortunately sheds less light on the Flemish School than on modern picture copying. It has every indication of being of very recent origin. Study the gold dotting on the ground, the drawing, the smearing of the face to create the appearance of old grime, the canvas. They tell their own story. It is a copy of some miracle-working Madonna picture. There is another and perhaps earlier version in Buckingham Palace.
2372. *Flinck, Govaert. Annunciation to the Shepherds.* A picture which the student of Rembrandt and his school would do well to study for certain types

(and their manner of drawing and painting) that have a Rembrandtesque look—those of the shepherds, for instance, as well as the angels and putti. Study also the colour and lighting and the Rembrandtesque hands. This picture is more like Bol or Eeckhout than Flinck. In the mix-up of Rembrandt and his pupils, it is not merely that Rembrandt is confused with Bol, but that Bol is confused with Flinck, Eeckhout, and Fabritius, and that they are all confused with one another. The artistic personality of each of these followers has yet to be established. Therefore it is at present necessary to say about many pictures merely that they are doubtful Rembrandts or Bols or Flincks without attempting to assign them arbitrarily or finally to any one.

2373. ——— *Portrait of a Young Girl*. One of Flinck's most graceful performances. It has charm of personality in the sitter and is painted with good light, air, and colour. The handling is not very sure, but the student may see in the chains and jewels how Flinck could produce something that might pass for Rembrandt's handling with the unobservant.

1656. **Florentine School. *Annunciation***. A school picture of some interest in art history. The angel and the Madonna may be related to the workshop of Verrocchio or Cosimo Rosselli. The picture shows many influences. The angel and the lilies are fairly good.

1663. ——— *Portrait of a Young Man*. The picture is somewhat curious in drawing but it is not inferior in spirit. It belongs somewhere near the workshop of Botticelli, which is what Mr. Berenson means when he attributes it to Amico di Sandro.

The drawing of the nose indicates the work of the man who is now known under that name. Compare it with No. 1300A, near at hand.

- 1643A. — *Esther Crowned by Ahasuerus*. It is not very well drawn, but by the use of gold and colours it has been made a panel of considerable decorative beauty. The types, the colour, and the gilding suggest Jacopo del Sellajo, who is just now the recipient of some things that will not fit Botticelli. Yet Jacopo is a painter of some originality and imagination in spite of modern criticism. Somewhat repainted.
- 1661A. — *Madonna and Child*. A little formal in the oval sweep of the blue drapery and a little stiff in the pose of the Madonna and Child; but it is an interesting picture for the student of attributions. It seems a common-enough school piece, but that should only add to the interest and the glory of the chase.
1662. — *History of Virginia*. A picture of some spirited action, with figures in bright costumes against grey architecture and landscape. It has the look of a Jacopo del Sellajo. Mr. Berenson thinks it by Amico di Sandro. Probably it is part of a cassone front. No note of it is to be found in the La Fenestre catalogue.
1274. — *St. John*. A flattened face which possesses much of the spirit and beauty that made Desiderio's reliefs famous. What fine feeling it has! Mr. Berenson thinks it by Piero di Cosimo, but the quality of it, the sentiment of it seem too fine for Piero. It looks as though done from a marble. Notice the sharpness of the profile.

N. N. ——— *Madonna, Child, and Four Angels*. A panel in distemper on a gesso ground, the white of which shows through in spots. Not too well drawn and a little crude, but a lovely bit of sentiment, as shown in all the faces—the angels in particular. How beautiful the gold work and the flowers! Without a number on the frame, and not to be found in the La Fenestre catalogue.

288. **Fouquet, Jean.** *Portrait of Guillaume Juvenal des Ursins*. A large figure in a red dress flattened against a gilded architectural background of much decorative beauty. The face is powerful and the figure large in bulk, but both are weakened by the prominence of the ornate background. The colour is rich in the books, cushion, and costume.

289. ——— *Portrait of Charles VII*. In the same vein and probably by the same hand that painted No. 288. This portrait is better sustained because of the less obtrusive ground at the back, but it has probably darkened in the flesh and robe like No. 288. Notice here, as a contrast to No. 288, the marked severity of the background. These two portraits are fairly well authenticated as Fouquets.

1300B. **Francesca, Piero della.** *Madonna and Child*.

** Of all the Madonnas in the room of the Italian Primitives, this is the most remarkable, the most inspiring, the most startling in its beauty. If art is a point of view and genius a way of looking at things, then here is certainly the unusual view and the individual vision. The picture violates almost all preconceived or ordinary conceptions of Madonnas, ideal faces, and figures. The face is not pretty, not even handsome; the figure is abnormally tall, flat in the bust, heavy in the waist, some-

what out of proportion in the head and neck; and the Child is perhaps too small. Yet here is art in the very oddness of the angle of vision, in the abnormal quality of the characterisation, in the lack of the obvious and the commonplace. In spite of its oddity, how lovely the type, how delicate the roundness of the contours, how charming the sentiment! Moreover, here is true artistic feeling—feeling for form and colour. How splendidly the rather awkward figures hold their place in the pattern! What a sky and distance and feeling for space! What wonderful depth and unusual quality of colour in the costume! Cast your eyes around the room, and match if you can those reds and blues. They are superb. The picture is like a star upon the wall. How it draws attention away from everything else near it! It was certainly never painted by Piero della Francesca. It lacks his firmness of drawing, his robustness of figure, his strength of characterisation. It is almost as certainly by Baldovinetti. Mr. Berenson has quite conclusively summed up the evidence for it in his “Study and Criticism of Italian Art,” vol. II, p. 23. On the frame it is No. 1300, and is sometimes catalogued under the School of Botticelli.

1435. **Francia, Francesco. *Nativity*.** A small but
 * lovely little picture with a landscape full of air and space. What a very pretty valley with distant mountains! The figures are as beautiful in colour as in sentiment. The picture is cold in light and rather hard in the drawing, but a little masterpiece notwithstanding.
1436. ——— ***Christ on the Cross*.** Somewhat excessive in its sentiment and perhaps overdone in its tragic

quality, but with a simple arrangement of the figures, a finely drawn nude on the ground, and a broad landscape. Like many of Francia's pictures, it is cold in the sky, where one sees not very realistic clouds. The colour is rather effective.

1437. ——— *Madonna and Child*. It is a school piece for all its close likeness to Francia. The hands are faulty in drawing and there is a glassy quality to the surface. The landscape is Francia-like but a little crude. Compare it with the Francia No. 1435, near at hand. In the drawing of the figures compare it again with No. 1436 by Francia, especially in the drawing of the hands.

1004. **French School (Burgundian, 15th Century).** *Pierre II, Duke of Bourbon, with St. Peter*. Part of a triptych, the centre of which is lost. A work of some interest in the history of art because representing the early French School which is now beginning to take shadowy form. The drawing seems larger than in the contemporary Netherlands work and the colour scheme is different. Of course there is a marked difference in the types. The red of the costume is rich but the green and purple lack a little in depth. The landscape is somewhat crude. Mr. Fry thinks this and its companion piece (No. 1005) emanated from the atelier of the Master of Moulins. This is possible. Compare the donors in No. 1005 and No. 1005A. Notice that the painting in No. 1005A is fatter, cleaner, surer than in No. 1005.

1005. ——— *Portrait of Anne of France with the Christ*. A companion wing to No. 1004 with probably a portion of it (at the right side, back of the donor) cut away. Brighter in colour than No. 1004 and

with the same kind of landscape. The same hand probably did both panels. The St. John suggests the influence of Memling. Repainted a little in the faces and hands.

1003. ——— *Portrait of Philippe le Bon.* A fine portrait, a perfect portrait of its kind. Other versions of it are to be seen in the Antwerp Museum (No. 538) and at Bruges (No. 1). It is primitive, clean-cut, white-faced, very true and honest. The hands are long in the fingers, with but little light and shade and much outline drawing. A beautiful green ground. What good spirit it has!
1002. ——— *Portrait of Jean sans Peur.* An ill-drawn, angular work with a sharp profile and mannered hands, but of unique quality as portraiture. It is not more sane than work done in a similar vein by Il Greco, but is just as interesting. Some features about it look very modern. Another version at Brussels is put down to a Van Eyck contemporary (No. 540), and the same type appears in the Sforza altar-piece (No. 515), left wing, at Brussels.
1000. ——— *Portrait of a Man with a Glass of Wine.* The drawing is large, if somewhat crude and lacking in skill, as may be seen in the hands, eyes, nose, mouth. The costume is simple in flat blacks. Notice the very good glass of wine. A true and honest piece of work with much character about it. See an article regarding it in the *Revue Archéologique*, September, 1910, p. 236.
998. ——— *Deposition.* This picture is somewhat similar in method to the *Retable du Parlement de Paris*, mentioned hereinafter. It is not by the same mas-

ter, but of the same school. It is a poorer picture without being poor in itself. Notice the ill-drawn heads, feet, and hands, the bright robes; but also notice that the picture has sincerity. Once put down to the School of Van Eyck.

N. N. ——— *St. Helena and the Miracle of the Holy Cross.*

* A picture possibly inspired by Bouts or some one of his school, but given with French types in the kneeling figures. The drawing is large though minute in patterns and jewels. An excellent piece of colour with much variety and yet unity. Notice the head coverings. And the charming little figure rising from the dead. The picture is not positively of French extraction.

N. N. **French School (15th Century).** *Portrait of a Child in Prayer.* Very simply done, like all this early French work, but rather effective in its line-drawing. Notice here the hands, the outline of the head and face, the beauty of the whites. It is not clever but it is honest.

N. N. **French School (about 1475).** *Retable du Parlement de Paris: Calvary.* The history of the early French School is still vague. The painters and their pictures are by no means accurately known or attributed. Here is a picture of French extraction that might be used as a criterion of one style at least. It is of marked technical excellence. Notice the unusual types of heads and hands, the peculiar break of the draperies at the arms and shoulders instead of at the bottom, the odd type of figure in the Christ, the singular landscape, the unique colours. It is well done in the robes of Charlemagne or St. Louis as in the grotesque types back of St. Denis, who is holding his head in his

hands. How fine the work is in its feeling, its spirit! Thought by some to be of Netherlandish origin. The John the Baptist has a slight suggestion of Memling, and John the Evangelist is a little in the vein of Van der Weyden.

1012. **French School (16th Century).** *Portrait of*
 * *Baron Montmorency.* The face and hands are stained and injured, but the beauty of the drawing is still apparent. The modelling of the eyes and brows, the doing of the skull and cheek-bones are noteworthy. A fine head with rich colour in the robes. It has character, force, power.
1015. — *Portrait of the Duc de Guise.* A portrait of the Clouet School, or possibly an old copy. The work is detailed but not niggled, as one may see in the costume, the hat, and the painting of the beard. These features are not, however, very well done. Nos. 1017, 1025, 1028, 1030 are of a quality similar to this picture.
683. — *Equestrian Portrait of Francis I.* A repetition of a work in the Uffizi Gallery at Florence (No. 667), attributed there to François Clouet. Done with much precision and beauty of colour. The horse is excellent. As for the likeness of Francis, it may prove interesting to compare it with No. 1007, hanging near at hand.
1028. — *Portrait of Chrestien de Savigny.* Very much in the style of No. 1015, and doubtless they both came from the same studio. This seems to be the better of the two. Both have dignity and character.
1017. — *Portrait of Michel de l'Hôpital.* Very smooth in its execution and with the look of a copy—only

one does not know the original. It is in the French miniature style, but enlarged and elaborated.

- N. N. ——— *Portrait of a Man*. A knee-piece of a man in red doublet and white coat, with hand on sword. The hand is abnormally large, but how well his head is drawn, especially the brow and hair! There is much sturdiness about the figure. The picture is stained.
1007. ——— *Portrait of Francis I*. The figure is flat and sacrificed to the ornamented coat from which the hands seem to protrude with some violence. The face is rather foolish in its look, but well drawn. The neck has been cleaned too much, as has also the coat. The costume is ornate in pearls and gold thread. Once attributed to Holbein.
1024. ——— *Portrait of Diana of France*. A smooth-faced, porcelain-like portrait, very prim and precise in its drawing of costume, but with a little broader use of the brush in the forehead and hair. No. 1027 is probably by the same hand.
- 1011A. ——— *Portrait of Marquise d'Elbœuf*. It has a look about it suggestive of the Flemish School of Gossart, but this may be no more than a superficial resemblance in colour. A smooth affair, but handsomely made.
1036. ——— *Henry III at the Foot of the Cross*. A very
* beautiful little picture full of the true spirit of art. The kneeling figure in his fine robes is excellent and the dark landscape makes a proper background for the cross. The figure on the cross is not that of a Dürer, but it is sufficiently well drawn. The same painter did portraits of the Duc d'Alençon and Charles IX at Chantilly (Musée Condé).

1013. **French School of Fontainebleau. *Diana*.** A
 * full-length figure of the goddess with the bow. Very graceful in outline and very effective as white on a dark landscape background. It has been much cleaned, which may account for some of the figure's whiteness. It shows the Italian influence of, say, Primaticcio?
- 1014A. — ***Venus at Her Toilet*.** Very graceful figures in a pyramidal composition. Suggestive of the School of Primaticcio. The surface has been too much cleaned, yet the picture is still fine in colour.
- 304A. **Froment d'Avignon. *King René d'Anjou and His Queen*.** These are strong, fine heads of almost Holbein character in their sincerity and truth. What a head and face that of King René! And what hands! As a statement of fact, it is excellent, although the work is neither very learned nor very subtle. The drawing is, in fact, rather crude, but very sincere.
1301. **Gaddi, Agnolo. *Annunciation*.** In the style of the Gaddi, with Giotto's figures somewhat refined and perhaps prettified, but still with good sentiment. The work was carried as far as the painter was competent to carry it at that time, and in that sense it is complete art without being complete in a modern sense. The gold work, the patterns, and colour are all excellent. How graceful the two angels for all their heavy figures—two angels instead of one!
1302. **Gaddi, Taddeo. *A Predella*.** Three panels of good action and harmonious colour, with some richness of effect in the gold work. Some of the draperies are well handled. The figures are sack-

like and Giottesque, but well put together, and the broken tones of colour are remarkable. Attributions of such panels as these are largely guesses.

1303. **Garbo, Raffaellino del.** *Coronation of the Virgin.* A pleasing type of the Madonna with music-making angels about her in a circle. Four robust saints in handsome robes below, making a square that balances and offsets the upper circle. A more restful picture than Raffaellino usually produced, though it is not inspired. It looks as though two hands had worked upon it originally, one below and one above, to say nothing of the restorer's hands that have tortured it since. Possibly Raffaellino's hand had nothing to do with it. It is injured at the top.
1553. **Garofalo (Benvenuto Tisi).** *The Sleep of Jesus.* The Child is heavy and ill drawn in the head, and the Madonna somewhat affected, as in the hands. The colour is fair, but the picture is not a good Garofalo.
- 2563A. **Geertgen tot Sint Jans (Gerard of Haarlem).**
 * *Resurrection of Lazarus.* A work of much strength and beauty. The draperies are given with great breadth for such early art, and even the figures are not sharply accented in drawing—not even in the hands. The heads are fine, but they have none of the Van Eyck minuteness about them, and the jewels are not finical or overdone in any way. The foreground is a wealth of colour and the background is a simple landscape of much truth in tree forms, mountains, sky. The composition is a simple, balanced grouping about the figure of Lazarus, and the colour scheme a series of repeated notes of red, green, blue, white, black. It suggests

the influence of Ouwater. There is no great certainty about the attribution, for Geertgen is only a spectre in art history, but the picture agrees with other pictures attributed to him at Vienna, Berlin, and Amsterdam. We may be reasonably certain that it is a fine picture, whoever painted it. Somewhat restored.

1279. **Gentile da Fabriano. *Virgin and Child with Donor*.** The picture is by some follower or pupil of Gentile—probably Jacopo Bellini—and certainly shows Gentile da Fabriano's influence. The Madonna (Jacopo Bellini's type) is attractive in her rich robe and odd halo. The kneeling donor has a head that might go on a coin by Vittore Pisano (who influenced Jacopo), and a robe fit for an angel. But the most interesting part of the picture lies in the background, with its cities, hills, and sky lighted from above. It is one of the earliest attempts at light from the sky (as reflected from the earth), and should be compared with the Flight into Egypt in the predella of Gentile's great altar-piece in the Florence Academy (No. 165). It should be borne in mind that Gentile went in the 1420s to Venice and became there the master of Jacopo Bellini, the father of Gentile Bellini, who with Carpaccio painted such astonishing views of Venice wherein the light came from the sky. The influence of Gentile da Fabriano on Venetian landscape can be traced directly. It shows in this picture at the starting-point. What beautiful colour in the robes, the landscape, the gold work!
1278. ——— ***Presentation in the Temple*.** This is interesting because it is one of the predella panels belonging to Gentile's altar-piece in the Florence Academy

(No. 165). It is now much repainted but still shows good colour and composition. Notice the feeling for light, shadow, and air.

2745. **German School (16th Century).** *Judgment of Paris.* It is not a very early picture. The drawing of the three nudes suggests some slight Italian influence. A strong little picture, not only in the types but in the drawing of the women. Notice the sarcasm of the Mars asleep. Also his and his companion's fine colour.

2745A. — *The Flagellation of Christ.* A brutal theme given with perhaps unnecessary brutality. The drawing and the proportions are grotesque, but they are atoned for in a measure by the virile richness and beauty of the colouring. What splendid blues, reds, greens, yellows! They are almost up to those of Thierry Bouts. The figures are repellent and the facial expressions are almost grimace, but in spite of all this there is large feeling for form. The drawing, though abnormal, is powerful.

2740. — *The Emperor Maximilian.* There are several repetitions of this figure in the German and Austrian galleries. It is positive in its drawing and quite fine in colour. With a very picturesque little landscape at the right.

1321. **Ghirlandajo, Domenico.** *The Visitation.* A large, formally composed, and well-drawn Ghirlandajo, but of rather prosaic spirit. The figure at the left is statuesque and academic; the one at the right has movement, earnestness, and some feeling. The robes are hard, the colour crude and wanting in depth, the architecture empty and quite unbelievable. Perhaps the sky and distant city

are the most attractive features of the picture, notwithstanding the excellent drawing of the figures. It is school work.

1322. ——— *Portrait of an Old Man and a Boy.* Very brilliant in its red, but noticeable more for its uncompromising realism than anything else. The painter has not glozed over the ugliness of the nose, or prettified the huge head, nor has he failed to give the comeliness of the boy. He has told the truth with forceful drawing and rather harsh painting. But he had a sense of beauty about landscape as you may see in the view at the back of the picture. For the rest, he believed that truth, honestly told, is always beautiful. And so it is—that is, in the right hands. The picture is injured in the forehead of the man and too much cleaned in both faces.

2711A. *Giltlinger, Gumpold. Adoration of Magi.* With strong heads, fine robes and jewels, odd architecture, and a deep blue sky. The horsemen at the back, the castle, and the angels up above are noteworthy. A picture that seems strange here in the Louvre, but one that is to be admired wherever seen. The painter to whom it is assigned is comparatively unknown. He worked at Augsburg.

1136. *Giorgione (Giorgio Barbarelli). A Rustic Concert.* A world-famous picture, much admired for its colour, its round figures, its landscape, and its idyllic spirit. It is put down to Giorgione with great certainty by some and denied with equal positiveness by others. It is apparently contradictory of other accepted pictures by Giorgione. If we accept the Dresden Sleeping Venus as his

type of the nude, with its white skin, refined lines, and delicate modelling, how are we to reconcile it with these carelessly drawn, brown-skinned, sun-tanned, fleshy figures that have little delicacy or refinement about them? If the serene, well-balanced landscape in the Castelfranco Madonna is his type of landscape, how again shall we reconcile it with this rather scattered scene, which seems more like a Palma or Catena background than anything we know in Giorgione? The plume-like foliage drooping out at the left above the standing figure is substantially the same as in the Catena Warrior adoring the Infant Christ (No. 234), in the National Gallery, London, and also in a loaned Holy Family, hanging there in 1912, attributed to Palma, but really by Catena. Catena followed Palma in landscape, and there is a Palmesque look about this Giorgione landscape. The triangle of sunlit landscape let in at the right is Palmesque, sheep and all, but it does not agree with the rest of the landscape, which is more like Catena. It looks as though Catena had appropriated that sunlit bit from some one like Palma and dovetailed it into this picture.

That, however, which is the most puzzling in this Rustic Concert is the fulness of the nude figures and a certain thinness in the seated figures, the latter being hardly Giorgionesque at all. The man seated at the right stirs memories of Catena again, as do the nudes. Those full figures of the women we think to have seen in Catena's work, but here they are more brown-skinned and perhaps stained with oil or varnish. Again we fancy we have seen them in Palma's work. Which painter did them? Is it Catena following Palma or Palma

himself? In other words, this picture does not speak strongly for Giorgione, as we know him, and is more like the work of his imitators. It may be by Palma or the masterwork of some inferior artist like Catena, in which he has done something so very good that we fail to recognise it as by him. It frequently happens in art history that a man's best things are given to his superiors while he is permitted to retain his worst.

It is a masterpiece, nevertheless, and in pastoral charm is quite worthy of Giorgione. What a superb back and turn of the head the seated nude figure shows us! In colour the central red is the key-note, and the blue landscape and sky moderate it. The white draperies are kept down in light to support the flesh notes. It is worth while going to the Moreau Collection, in another wing of the Louvre, to see how Manet took this theme for his *Déjeuner sur l'herbe* there shown. How he brutalised it, squeezed all of the poetic and idyllic out of it, is there apparent. However, he atoned in measure by some excellent painting.

The *Rustic Concert* is a work to be studied, not as the work of a first-class master, but as the work of a Palma or the masterpiece of some Catena of the brush. It has been repainted in spots, noticeably the hands, which were never too well drawn. See the note on the Staedel Institute Palma (No. 668). Morelli some years ago published a drawing by Campagnola, in the Malcolm Collection, which shows the seated nude figure in this *Concert*.

1135. — *The Holy Family with St. Sebastian*. The figures in the foreground are flattened and hardly belong to the landscape. Nor is the proportion

of the donor to the saints well maintained. The types, colouring, shadows, and flesh are pseudo-Giorgionesque or perhaps Palmesque. Crowe and Cavalcaselle put it down to Pellegrino da San Daniele and Berenson to Cariani. The sky and hills have some strength of colour and handling. Not a wonderful picture, whoever did it.

1312. **Giotto di Bondone.** *St. Francis Receiving the Stigmata.* A large picture, but not distinctively of Giotto's quality. It does not show the great painter of the Arena Chapel frescoes. Possibly it is much changed in the flesh notes as well as in the landscape and the gold ground. The figures below are even less like Giotto than the St. Francis. The whole work probably belongs to Giotto's school. See also Nos. 1314 to 1316, inclusive, for work belonging somewhere near Giotto.

1318. **Girolamo dai Libri.** *Madonna and Child.* A little insipid in the face of the Madonna, as also in the cherubs. It is by some pupil or follower. There is the heavy eyelid of Caroto, but otherwise it is not like his work. The colour is not bad. The picture has been overcleaned.

1999. **Gossart, Jan (Mabuse).** *Portrait of a Benedictine.* It has been too much cleaned, but still shows good drawing in the face and hands. The attribution is probably correct.

1997 } ——— *Madonna and Child with Donor.* A diptych
1998 } quite in Gossart's style, but unfortunately almost colourless from too much cleaning. The donor's portrait is simple, true, and excellent, with strongly modelled cheek-bones and well-articulated hands. The Child's and the Madonna's hands are less well drawn.

2377. **Goyen, Jan van.** *River in Holland.* A grey picture of some merit, but rather muddy in colour, not only in the buildings, but in the sky—a muddiness often seen in Van Goyen's pupil, Salomon van Ruisdael. No. 2375 is of the same opaque quality, while No. 2378 is darker in key.
- N. N. Greco, Il (Domenico Theotocopuli).** *Christ on the Cross.* A somewhat colourless picture with a little more Il Greco eccentricity in the background than usual. The clouds look like a snowy mountain landscape. The portraits below are very good. The figure of Christ is not wanting in pathos, in intensity of feeling, in some grace of form; but it is not convincing in its truth to reality. The whites are silvery-grey, the blacks of the clouds are smoky. The picture has an agreeable surface.
- N. N. —** *Portrait of King Ferdinand.* A mannered performance, of course, but with some style about it. It shows the rather eccentric individuality of the painter, but is attractive in spite of grotesqueness. The drawing is not justifiable, and the flesh is blackish. The colour is attractive, but not so variegated as is usually shown in his figure compositions. A strange personality in the king, whose features recall those of the present king of Spain.
1328. **Guardi, Francesco.** *The Doge Going Aboard the Bucentaur.* A spotty picture, but with a good effect of colour and light. The drawing is careless.
1333. **—** *College Hall in the Ducal Palace.* A fine interior with good light, air, and splendour of effect. Notice the sketchy painting of the pictures of Tintoretto and Veronese upon the wall and ceiling. A very handsome Guardi for all the repetition of the figures of senators at the back.

1332. ——— *Procession of the Doge to San Zaccaria*. The procession is extremely well given, not only in colour and light, but in movement from left to right. How well the mass of the building cuts the sky, especially in the campanile at the right! And what a very good Venetian sky! See it repeated in No. 1329, where the building of the Salute is frail and not well done.
1334. ——— *Coronation of the Doge*. Excellent for the light and shade of it (though both of them are dark in key), for the massing of the crowd, and for the colour. The regularity of the lines of the palace is a little trying.
2389. **Hals, Dirck.** *Rustic Feast*. There is much spotting of the surface with small high lights and some effort at facile handling of a staccato kind. The colouring is better than the spirit—the latter being too conscious. All the characters seem posing for their pictures. The two central figures, with variations, appear in a canvas in the Altman Collection, New York, there ascribed to Frans Hals. The ruffs here might be compared with those in the Van Berensteyn portraits by Frans Hals, Nos. 2386 and 2387.
2384. **Hals, Frans.** *The Gipsy*. A picture of much vivacity and spirit. The superabundant life and animal spirits of it are fascinating. How firmly the face is modelled, and what freedom in the handling! It is little more than a sketch, but what a revelation it is of the man behind the brush as well as the model! Notwithstanding its excellence it is not too certainly by Hals. His son, Frans, did just as good work as this.

2383. ——— *Portrait of René Descartes.* A sober and serious portrait without bluster or bravura, giving the truth in the large, broad way that the painter saw it. There is nothing about it that startles, but a great deal that commands respect.
2385. ——— *Portrait of a Woman.* It is not unlike No. 2383 in being quiet and dignified. There is no display of handling—in fact, the face and head look a little mealy, as though done with difficulty. The whites have probably been retouched.
- 2386 } ——— *Portraits of Nicolas van Berensteyn and*
 2387 } *Wife.* The man's portrait is better than the
 * woman's. The head and hands of the man are excellent—the hands quite in the style of Frans Hals, and the head not only fine in modelling, but marked by a noble seriousness, even sadness. But the ruff, and cuff, and costume, the hair and the flesh of the face point rather to some one like Dirck Hals than to Frans Hals. They seem too petty, too fussy for the bigger brother. This is equally true of the woman's portrait, with its lace work and good pattern in the dress. It is possible that Hals was largely helped in this picture by Dirck. The third picture of the series, No. 2388, confirms such a theory, for it is even less typical of Frans Hals than the two just considered. Both of these portraits have been much restored, which may account for their smoothness of costume.
2388. ——— *The Van Berensteyn Family.* This picture has been badly restored, and the little girl at the right was, of course, an afterthought—something added to the canvas by an alien hand. Aside from its hands and faces, the canvas does not show Frans Hals in any way. At no time in his career

did he do such small and finical work as is here shown in the ruffs, laces, chains, jewellery, flowers, leaves, grasses. It is useless to suggest that this is the early style of Hals. The picture does not show the early style of any one, but rather the mature style of a small and careful painter such as Dirck Hals. It is not a bad picture by any means, but it must have been worked upon largely by Hals's pupils or helpers, of whom Dirck was one. The hands and hair are pretty, and even the spirit of it seems much too "elegant" for Frans Hals. If we accept the catalogue date of 1620, Hals was thirty-six years of age when this picture was painted, and four years before he had done the picture No. 123 at Haarlem, which is much broader and quite different from this in handling. It is not in the style of Hals, and is probably a workshop picture—that is, he planned it, and Dirck and others executed it. The same hand or hands probably did the Laughing Cavalier in the Wallace Collection, the Man with a Sword in the Lichtenstein Gallery, Vienna, the Nurse and Child at Berlin.

2397. **Helst, Bartholomaeus van der.** *Portraits of a Man and Woman.* They are done in Van der Helst's thinner, smoother manner, but not without good drawing in the heads and hands. How well the man's sash, the woman's satin dress are rendered! A Dutch town is shown at the back.
2001. **Hemessen, Jan van.** *Tobit and His Father.* With considerable force in the drawing and some darkness in the colouring. The figure at the left is Heemskerck's (not Hemessen's) model. The same figure is seen in the Heemskerck at Haarlem

(No. 151) and again at Brussels (No. 211). One may draw his own conclusions not only from the model, but the workmanship.

1706. **Herrera, Francisco de.** *St. Basil Dictating His Doctrine.* Without other examples of Herrera at hand, this picture gives a distorted idea of the painter. He was not quite such a black, brutal painter as is here indicated. The picture is not representative, nor is it pleasing.
2401. **Heyden, Jan van der.** *A Village in Holland.* An interesting townscape with good sky, water, and air. The delightful little figures are said to be painted by Adriaen van de Velde, and the boats by his brother, Willem van de Velde. It is doubtful, however, if three hands working on the picture could have kept it together so well.
2402. ——— *Landscape.* Quite a charming bit of sky, trees, and foreground, whoever did it. A good little picture to live with.
- 2404A. **Hobbema, Meindert.** *Landscape.* A fine example of Hobbema's conventional landscape, with his grey sky, his ground lighted in spots, and his trees with their formal foliage. It is his convention at its best.
2404. ——— *Water Mill.* Less conventional than No. 2404A, but a truer and better picture because more closely studied from the model. But the truth to nature of these Dutchmen—Hobbema, Ruysdael, or Everdingen—is not at all comparable to their truth to a grey-toned art-formula, got somehow from Italy. It is the Italian tradition adapted with modifications to Holland.
2713. **Holbein the Younger, Hans.** *Portrait of Nicolas Kratzer.* This is a portrait in which the

painter lugs in a great many accessory objects to indicate the man's profession, and spoils the picture in doing so. It is much hurt by the light wall and the instruments hung upon it, and also by the instruments placed upon the table in the foreground. It lacks in concentration as in colour. One may fairly question if Holbein, who loved simple, or at least rich-coloured, backgrounds was entirely responsible for this picture. The picture is repainted, as one may see by the hands; besides, it has been rubbed until there is now a softness—a lack of firmness—in the drawing. It belongs in the same category with the Gisze portrait at Berlin (No. 586).

2714. ——— *Portrait of Bishop Warham.* There is another portrait like this in Lambeth Palace. This may be a repetition by Holbein himself, and then again it may be an old copy. The hands and face are wanting in firmness and sureness of drawing. In either event the picture is not bad in colour, but is hurt by the accessory objects in the composition. They are ornate, decorative, beautifully done, but superfluous, unnecessary, in the way.

2715. ——— *Portrait of Erasmus.* There are several of these Erasmus portraits in existence, but this is a complete profile view and different from any of the others. It shows Erasmus the humanist, with the close mouth, the tired eye, the keen nose, and hollow cheek of the scholar. And with precise fingers and hands, penning perhaps a "Praise of Folly." What a psychological study it is! What a facial outline! What perfect drawing! Look at the mouth, cheek, and neck. Nor does it lack in colour or decorative charm. Look at the beau-

**

tifully patterned background, the flesh notes, the white spot of paper. The portrait is a wonder and a delight.

2717. ——— *Portrait of Sir Thomas More or Sir Henry Wyatt*. The identity of the sitter is uncertain, but not that of the painter. This is Holbein at his best. The face is a marvel of positive, yes, superlative drawing, every scrap of which serves to bring out the spirit and character of the man. The eyes, the nose, the mouth—particularly the mouth distorted by the loss of teeth—are not more remarkable than the flabby cheeks and heavy chin. This is the realism of truths that mean something, that count in bringing the type and class and personality of the man before you. It is a wonderful portrait, the like of which not even Holbein often achieved. The hands are quite as much of a portrait as the face.

2718. ——— *Portrait of Anne of Cleves*. This is the portrait that Holbein is supposed to have painted for Henry the Eighth when he was thinking of marrying Anne of Cleves. It has not escaped restoration in the face and hands, but is still lovely in its quiet, restful pose, its clasped hands and rather sad face, its beautiful head-dress, its rare red costume and blue background. It has charm about it as well as truth. To be considered critically in connection with Holbein's Duchess of Milan (No. 2475) in the National Gallery, London, also painted for Henry the Eighth, and for a similar purpose. The London picture is much the finer and firmer in execution. This Louvre work, fine as it is, has the surface of a copy. The doing of the pearls and the head-dress is weak and forceless.

2719. ——— *Portrait of Richard Southwell*. It is probably a copy of the Uffizi picture (No. 765), but a fairly good one. The clearness of the outline is well given, even in the copy.
2720. ——— *Portrait of a Man*. In the Holbein style and of his school, but possibly not by him. He would hardly have drawn that wooden hand, or painted that fur collar, though old repainting might account for both. The ground is so dark the figure can be seen only with difficulty. The hair and cap are almost lost in it.
2414. *Hooch, Pieter de. Interior of a Dutch House.*
* A good De Hooch, but perhaps not his best effort. The light on the wall at the back is very charming, and the light gradation as shown in the tile floor is subtle. The figures are in shadow and not too well drawn, but effective as form and colour. One of his simple, rather homely subjects, but one he had probably seen oftener, known better, and loved more truly than his later more aristocratic drawing-rooms.
2415. ——— *Dutch Interior*. This is one of De Hooch's high-life scenes, showing much ornate furniture and costume. The chief figures at the left are very rich in colour; the people at the back are less important. The light of the picture is fair, as also the drawing of the room, the columns, and the floor. Notice the painting of the light on the patterned wall at the back and the atmospheric quality of the room. The red dress is slightly reflected from the marble.
1644. *Italian School. Portrait of a Young Man*. This portrait has been attributed to Giorgione, Raphael,

Francia, Sebastiano del Piombo. Crowe and Cavalcaselle think it by Franciabigio and Mr. Berenson gives it to Bugiardini. It is perhaps too early a work for any one of them except Francia, whom it doesn't fit in any way. The light and shade rather point to Leonardo's influence, and the trees suggest Franciabigio or Bugiardini. It is an acrid type with pinched drawing and cramped hands, but it is not wanting in good workmanship of a constrained, almost Early Renaissance character. The landscape is very good. Originally in a smaller frame, but now enlarged (with restorations and new materials) at the sides, notably in the trees at left.

2721. **Italian School (North). *Annunciation*.** This is a picture of decorative beauty in its gilded robes and ornamental designs in stone and wood. Besides that, it has the oddest Italian landscape ever seen in north Italy. Notice the houses and sky of the background, and also the beauty of the gold vase with red flowers, the banked roses along the stone screen in the foreground. The angel sliding down from the sky on what looks like a golden sled is a Germanic type, as is also the Madonna. The picture is a puzzle as to its painter. Crowe and Cavalcaselle thought it by Justus of Germany. The frame is new, and the wings were not painted by the same hand as the central panel.
1677. — ***Four Persons Before a Portico*.** It is red in colour, hot in the flesh, and not very well painted. Possibly some follower of Melozzo da Forlì did it. Not an important work.
2013. **Jordaens, Jacob. *Infancy of Jupiter*.** The best
* Jordaens in the Louvre. There is quite an effect

of light in the central figure. The three flesh notes are kept well in accord with slight predominance given to the female figure. The colour is virile and positive not only in the figures but in the red cloth and blue sky. There has been too much rubbing with that cleaning-room device—the ball of cotton. The surfaces are hurt a little.

2014. ——— *The King Drinks*. A motive that Jordaens repeated at Brussels and elsewhere. The group is animated and the light true, though not sufficiently concentrated for effect. The surface is smoother than usual, and the colour cooler. Not a bad picture, but not one of Jordaens's best.
2016. ——— *Portrait of Admiral de Ruyter*. A fine portrait of the large and fleshy type. The head and the face are flabby (probably peculiarities of the model), and the shadows somewhat dusky. One cannot be sure that because the face is red Jordaens painted it, though he probably did. The brush-work on the head indicates as much. The hands are not too well drawn, even for fat hands. The same brush perhaps painted the so-called Velasquez of Admiral Borro at Berlin (No. 413A), which see.
- 2438 bis. Keyser, Thomas de. *Portrait of a Man*. Precisely and firmly drawn, with nothing slurred or omitted and also nothing left to the imagination. It is all there with a photographic exactness that is a little wearisome.
1601. Leonardo da Vinci. *Portrait of Mona Lisa*.
*** The fact that this portrait was stolen from the Louvre and that its disappearance led to much newspaper comment among the nations may increase present interest in the picture, but does not

improve its artistic merit in any way. On the contrary, the trip to Italy and back has resulted in just a trifle more rubbing of the surface, and every one knows that it had enough before it left the Louvre. Again, that "mysterious smile," that many talk about, has little to do with the portrait as a work of art, except as Leonardo thereby sought to give the lovable character, the sweetness of mood of the sitter. There is no "mystery" about it; she is not a riddle, nor a sphinx, nor world-weary, nor representative of the ages. These are things read into the picture by imaginative people, like Walter Pater, but not put into it by Leonardo. The painter was painting the portrait of Madonna Elisabetta Gherardini, the wife of Francesco del Giocondo, and he gave her a smile possibly because she possessed it in reality, but probably because he had got into the studio habit of painting smiling people. Look about you in the Louvre at Leonardo's St. Anne (No. 1598) or the Madonna of the Rocks (No. 1599) or the Lucrezia Crivelli (No. 1600), and you will see the same smile. All the Leonardos, genuine and false alike, have it. It was a mannerism of his taken up by his pupils, and repeated parrot-like by them, with no attempt at mystery or even a haunting quality. A smiling face made a round face with beautifully turned surfaces and contours, and the painters were seeking the contours rather than the smile.

About the only things left in the Mona Lisa are its drawing, its light and shade, and its contours. Even these are badly injured, but there is still the tang of great beauty about them just as there is in the battered and broken Samothracian Victory outside on the stair landing. The picture was

painted with the greatest skill by a great master, and as long as an inch of it remains that skill will be apparent and stand for art in its best sense. The drawing and modelling are now flattened somewhat by much cleaning and rubbing. This is noticeable on the forehead, nose, breast, and hands. The cleaning has also hardened or made less subtle the contours of the nose, brows, lips, cheeks, and chin. But how beautiful they are yet! What wonderful rounding of flesh into graceful lines and forms! You can see this now better in the hands than in the face. What superb hands, with their beautifully turned fingers and round wrist! You will never again see such beautiful hands in art, such refined, aristocratic, and yet serviceable hands. They are perfect.

The light and shade (Leonardo's great technical achievement) is now somewhat falsified. The high lights have been rubbed grey, and the shadows seem to have shrunk into the hollows of the eyes, nostrils, lips, and throat. The contrast is now too sharp and quite the reverse of that which Leonardo first put out. He wrote: "As smoke loses itself in the air so are your lights and shadows to pass from one to the other without any apparent separation." That effect is wanting now because the picture has been flayed and rubbed. That plaint is so frequent in these notes that perhaps it needs substantiation occasionally. Therefore, hear what Vasari said about this picture. He wrote: "The eyes had that moisture and sparkle which we see continually in nature, and cannot be rendered without great difficulty. The lashes, showing how the hairs grew in the skin, in one part thicker and in another thinner, and following the curves

of the pores, could not be more natural. The nose, with its nostrils pink and tender, seemed to be alive. The mouth, with its line of separation and its extremities united by the red of the lips with the carnations of the face, seems not colour but really flesh. In the dimple of the throat." etc. There was probably some basis for Vasari's rhapsody, but now look at the portrait and see, if you can, the lashes, the curves of the pores, the pink and tender nostrils, the red of the lips, the carnations of the face. They were rubbed off, cleaned off by alcohol and other solvents many years ago. The face is now grey, lead-hued; and so far as colour goes the picture shows almost as well in black-and-white reproduction. Go close and look at the picture and you can easily see the worn-down look of the surface.

But it is a famous masterpiece and famous not without good reason. Originally, it must have been perfect technically. You have not yet looked at the structure of the head, throat, bust, and figure. You have not noticed the roundness of the head, the bulk of the body, the arms within the sleeves, the beautiful drawing of the costume, the dark halo of the hair about the face. And mentally what serenity there is about it! What calmness and repose! She is not a sphinx, smiling amid the chaos of the world back of her, but an Italian beauty, seated on a balcony overlooking an Italian-shore landscape—a superb woman of the Renaissance, with the proper aplomb belonging to her rank. The portrait is the best authenticated of Leonardo's works, though after the Italian episode there will doubtless be those to believe that the original never came back.

1598. — *St. Anne, Madonna, and Child.* In bad condition, being much stained, cleaned, and restored; but it still holds Leonardo's design and reveals his famous light and shade in the faces and figures. His graceful contours may be seen in the smooth turn of the brows, cheeks, chins, necks, shoulders, arms. Notice them particularly in the face, neck, and shoulder of the Madonna. Notice also the sweep of graceful lines in the Madonna's draperies from the shoulder and hip and in the blue drapery falling to the feet. The landscape at the back is mountainous and fantastic. The blue background does not marry or unite with the brown foreground and middle distance. The mountain forms and the foreground under the feet show rock cleavage and stratification—things that reveal Leonardo's scientific information, though his master, Verrocchio, knew about them before him. The tree is somewhat flat, conventional, and blackish. The colour is nearly gone but still pleases. Notice the drawing of the feet for comparison with other pictures put down to Leonardo in this gallery. You may see where Raphael appropriated them in *La Belle Jardinière* (No. 1496).
1265. — *Annunciation.* This little panel is attributed to Leonardo for no particular reason except that, as an Irishman might say, the Madonna looks as though painted by Lorenzo di Credi. The drapery, however, is Leonardesque and suggests the youthful Leonardo. It probably never cut much of a figure as art and does not now. It is a hesitating affair, done for a predella, perhaps, with rather good light and shade in the building at the right. A larger variation with some contradictions in the Uffizi which is also attributed to Leonardo (No. 1288).

1599. — ***Madonna of the Rocks.*** This must be accepted as a Leonardo, coming as it did, almost beyond a doubt, directly from the collection of Francis I and bearing on its face evidences of its genuineness. It is not a supreme example of Leonardo, nor did he do all of it. A study of Leonardo drapery among the drawings by old masters in another part of the Louvre will suggest that Leonardo did not formally arrange and spread the drapery in pleats as in the blue dress of the Madonna at the bottom, and that he did not crinkle drapery with a papery quality to it as in the yellow-coloured silk in the centre. Moreover, the mountain landscape is more fantastic than in the St. Anne or the Mona Lisa, though a similar showing of rock stratification is made in the foreground. The faces are a little sugary and have been too much cleaned. They have not the roundness of contours that are shown in the larger St. Anne picture, nor are the draperies here managed with a regard for the sweep of line of the St. Anne. The drawing is right enough, and the shadows are, perhaps, over-emphasised in such depressions as dimples, eyes, and mouths. The whole picture has darkened but is still fine in colour. The composition is pyramidal, with the diagonal lines running off to the little St. John on one side and the angel on the other side. It is one of the few pictures by Leonardo still extant, and must serve, in measure, as a criterion for judging other works attributed to him. See the note on the Leonardo Madonna of the Rocks, No. 1093, in the National Gallery, London.
1597. — ***St. John Baptist.*** It should be compared closely with the Madonna of the Rocks, first in

the matter of light and shade. It is excessive in this respect, in its sooty shadows, for instance. Leonardo was, perhaps, exaggerated in his "sfumato," but his follower here intensifies the exaggeration. Next, the forefinger and hand of the St. John should be compared with those of the angel. The latter have articulation in the joints and knuckles; the former are round and smooth. The shoulder again, so round, smooth, and boneless, is quite different from those of the children in the Madonna of the Rocks or that of the Madonna in the St. Anne picture (No. 1598). The comparison may be carried into the drawing of the eyes, nose, forehead, mouth, chin. The handling cannot be compared because the pictures have been too much cleaned and restored, but it may be noted that the hair is much coarser in the St. John, both in lighting and in painting. The Mona Lisa smile is here and is overdone. It is too sweet. A close study of the picture will lead to the conclusion that if Leonardo did it his hand had lost its cunning. It is probably the work of a follower—some one close to Salaino.

1602. ———*Bacchus*. A comparison may be instituted between this picture and the Madonna of the Rocks in the same way as with No. 1597. The comparison should take up hand and forefinger with hand and forefinger, face with face, contour with contour, line with line. The conclusion may be reached that it is a poorer picture than No. 1597 and is by some follower of the school like Cesare da Sesto. The landscape is not bad, but it is not Leonardesque in trees, sky, mountains, or foreground. The figure has been much cleaned and flattened in the modelling—something in which it was, per-

haps, never very strong. Look at the shoulders for this.

1600. ——— *Portrait of Lucrezia Crivelli*. A comparison of this head with the head of the Madonna of the Rocks would not result in any great triumph for the latter. For this portrait is extremely well done, and if it is not given to Leonardo it is not because it is unworthy of him. It is very accurately drawn, a little hard in the hair, perhaps, but beautiful in the contours of the nose, cheeks, and chin, and well drawn in the mouth, the throat, and the bust. There is a little flash of light under the jaw apparently reflected from the dress. The dress is rich and warm, beautiful in pattern and colour, lovely in texture and surface. A fine portrait of a charming type, and the only fault that one finds with it is that it is a trifle smooth and pretty in its surfaces. It is not unworthy of Leonardo, only it is not what we expect from him or imagine he might have done. If we compare it closely with the portrait, No. 1531, here attributed to Solario, we may get a suggestion of its possible painter. The same hand (not Solario's) possibly did them both. There is not only a family likeness between them, but the drawing, colour, shadows, surface, and texture are similar. Notice the way the head is posed and the shadows fall on the neck. Even the little mannerism of the reflected light on the jaw appears in No. 1531, though in less degree. The painter of these portraits also did No. 433 in the Castello Museum at Milan, there attributed to Boltraffio. The Lucrezia Crivelli has been cleaned but is still yellow with oil or varnish.

- 1603A. ——— *Madonna and Child*. Put down in the catalogue as a Flemish copy of Leonardo. It is by

the same hand that did the so-called Leonardo (No. 1493) at Munich and the attributed Lorenzo di Credi (No. 13) at Dresden. It is practically a replica of the Munich picture.

1343. **Lippi, Fra Filippo.** *The Nativity.* The attribution is not believable. The landscape alone, with its distance and light sky, would deny it. The Madonna is as far a remove from the familiar face and figure of the supposed Lucrezia Buti as the Child from Filippo's usual type. But the Madonna is lovely, the landscape is interesting, and the angels in the clouds are charming even if none of them is by Fra Filippo. The ruin is somewhat regular in its decay and the Joseph hard and leathery. Compare it with No. 1344—a genuine Filippo but now rather darkened. No. 1343 is by some eclectic painter who shows various influences.
1344. — *Madonna Enthroned with Saints.* A large and important picture now become somewhat darkened in the flesh notes. The drawing is a little formal, the drapery angular, the colour subdued, the angel types with their gilded wings very pure and tender, the Madonna and Child a little heavy. The light of the picture (as well as the colour) is dull, as note the sky. Lighting from the sky was just begun at this time, and at first it was not well understood. Perhaps the handsomest part of the picture is the kneeling saint at the left. What a wonderful red robe he wears, how beautifully it is disposed as regards its lines, and how cleverly handled it is in its shadows! The angel at the right repeats the red note.
1345. — *Madonna and Child.* A bright panel painted in all probability by some painter of the Floren-

tine School of name unknown. The angels at the back are most attractive and not unlike Filippo's. The Madonna is angular in the jaw and not attractive in the figure, but again suggests some one in Filippo's School, or possibly a follower of Botticelli.

N. N. **Lorenzo Monaco.** *Christ in the Garden and the Women at the Tomb.* Two panels of an altarpiece joined together and now having much depth of colour and richness of old gilding, especially in the haloes. The work is not particularly well done, but has feeling, with a decorative sense. The robes are excellent in colour. How well the space is filled! The outside frame hurts the effect.

1349. **Lotto, Lorenzo.** *Woman Taken in Adultery.*
 ** A fine picture in its massed group, its action, its types, its characterisation. Notice as a rare thing in Italian art that all these heads and faces are distinctly and positively Jewish. And what heads and faces they are, from the wailing culprit to her brutal accusers on either side of her! What colour is here! It has variety and harmony, depth and yet beauty and splendour. Notice also the atmospheric envelope, the feeling of dark recesses and shadows, out of which come mysterious half-seen heads and faces. How wonderful these faces are in shadow, as, for instance, the second at the left! The right side of the picture is less interesting. Cleaned in the neck and head of the woman and somewhat repainted in spots, but the drawing and colour are still fine. A masterful picture, especially in the feeling of the crowd.

1350. — *St. Jerome in the Desert.* An early Lotto, and valuable largely on account of filling out his artistic biography. The landscape is the picture.

It is done minutely, but has depth and truth about it. How fine it is in its shadows, its rock-drawing, its trees! St. Jerome is merely a note of colour—a note repeated in the sky at the back.

1351. — *Holy Family*. The picture is cold in blues, which are reflected even from the white cloth under the Child and from the draperies and wings of the angels. The reds and yellows of the saints at either side fail to relieve the blue-grey tone of the picture. Lotto's management of colour and light here is quite the reverse of Correggio's method. The centre of this picture is cold and surrounded by warm notes. The scheme is not altogether successful. But the picture is charming in the sentiment and pathos of the Madonna, as also in the beautiful angels back of her. Notice the heads of the two angels as they show beneath the white wings. They are very lovely. An odd picture in the all-blue robing of the Madonna, and the all-white of the angels. Odd again in the subject, which is neither a Holy Family nor a Nativity but in the nature of a Discovery.

- 1359 } **Luini, Bernardino. *Adoration of Magi*.** (In
1360 } the Salle Duchâtel, Hall V.) A number of frescoes
* by Luini and his school are here shown together. In them Luini's smooth, graceful style and harmonious colour show to great advantage. They are not marvels of strength but certainly possess grace of form and contour, with much charm of colour. The gold work is effective and decorative. These frescoes, with those at Milan, seem to go far beyond any of his easel pictures.

1353. — *Holy Family*. It has some agreeable colour and is not badly drawn, but one wearies of the re-

peated note of sentiment—the saccharine quality of it.

1354. ——— *The Sleep of Jesus*. A graceful Luini, with warm colour and an atmosphere that is, perhaps, too substantial. Luini, after Leonardo, was one of the best of the Milanese School—a very decorative and pleasing painter, if not a commanding one. See the frescoes in the Salle Duchâtel, Nos. 1359 and 1360. This picture was formerly attributed to Solario. It is even now an odd Luini, having less of the cloying and insipid than usually goes with his works.
1355. ——— *Salome with the Head of John the Baptist*. An excellent example of Luini in his softer and prettier mood. It is agreeable recitation, if not very realistic or forceful work. The drawing is good, and the colour is pleasing.
996. **Malouel, Jean** (Attributed). *The Dead Christ*. The painter is supposed to have been an uncle of Pol de Limbourg. The drawing is still half Byzantine in the hands and eyes, and the sentiment or feeling of it has a Byzantine quality. The figures fill the circle fairly well, and the colour is good. In the La Fenestre catalogue it is under the French School of the fourteenth century.
995. **Malouel (Jean) and Bellechose (Henri)**. (Attributed.) *Last Communion and Martyrdom of St. Denis*. A primitive work with much harsh realistic drawing in the figures and with simple, pure colours that have depth and beauty. Look at the quality of the blues and reds. The gold work is decorative. See also No. 996.
1367. **Mainardi, Bastiano**. *The Virgin and the Child*. It is a little ornate in costume, haloes, and lilies

and somewhat weak in sentiment and drawing. The contours are round, the surfaces smooth, and all the faces too full for their skins. It is porcelain-like in texture. The landscape at the left is interesting. There exist several versions or copies of this work, which seems to have been popular at one time.

1367A. — *Madonna and Child*. A rather fine picture in type and sentiment—too fine in sentiment for Mainardi, though it has peculiarities like the columns and the hand that seem to point toward him. These latter are, however, superficial. It is nearer allied in spirit to the so-called Botticelli (No. 1300A), though it seems impossible that one painter could have done both of them. They are not of the same kind or quality. This picture has much loftiness of pose and beauty of feeling. The drawing is not bad, the colour quite rich, and the atmospheric setting very good. The books at the right suggest Mainardi again, but Mr. Berenson intimates, with a query, that it was painted by Piero Pollajuolo. Perhaps that is a better attribution, though the picture seems too good for Piero.

1372. **Manni, Gianniccolo.** *Holy Family*. A picture by a close follower of the Perugino formulas, with gilding, architecture, robes, landscape—all the tools and trappings of Umbrian art—and with not bad decorative results. It is more mature in small features than Perugino, but lacks in originality. Everything here is appropriated from other painters. See the pictures put down to Manni (Nos. 1369, 1370, 1371), all of them pleasing in colour and all of them suggestive of the Perugino-Pinturicchio tradition.

1374. Mantegna, Andrea. *Madonna of Victory*.

* Painted for the anniversary of the battle of Fornovo, where Gonzaga believed he had defeated Charles VIII. Quite a famous picture, and bristling with excellences, but hardly Mantegna's masterwork. It has too much in it and is too crowded for its space. The Gonzaga kneeling is undersized and looks like a pygmy, the saint back of him is a giant, while the Madonna is neither one thing nor the other. Beautifully drawn, except in spots here and there, and with that foreshortened hand of the Madonna which we see in Leonardo's Madonna of the Rocks and Correggio's Madonna of St. Francis at Dresden. All the detail is wrought with care and accuracy; the textures in the stuffs, armour, and marbles of the throne are given quite perfectly; the robes are as beautiful in colour as in drawing. The arabesque of fruit and leaves at the back, with coral and beads, is again quite perfect, reminding one of the same effect in the frescoes of Mantegna at Mantua, and the Parma frescoes of Correggio. But the united impression is not good. The picture lacks in sacrifice and subordination, and is hard, almost rigid, in its figures, its throne, and its arabesque. That is the Early Renaissance of it. But of course it is a work of note, despite any flaws that one may feel in it.

1373. — *Calvary*. In the early hard style of Mantegna, with much rigidity in the figures, as though they had been modelled in bronze. The draperies also show the influence of sculpture—the sculpture of Donatello. But the types are noble, lofty, majestic in their dignity and presence; and some of the heads are strong in their characterisation, as notice those

of the soldiers. The figures on the crosses are contorted and stiffened. What precise but accurate drawing appears everywhere! The landscape is a bit crude in the sky and rather small in its detail of cities and towns. The picture was part of a predella of an altar-piece done for the Church of San Zeno, at Verona, and may have been worked upon by pupils.

1375. ———*Parnassus*. It has always been difficult to reconcile this picture and No. 1376 with Mantegna's late work in other galleries. For Mantegna was an Early Renaissance painter, with great power and dignity in his figures and great knowledge of both nature and art, but rigid, statuesque, positive, with uncompromising lines that were more often angular than flowing. He seldom shows or suggests the grace of the High Renaissance in his figures. Yet here in these pictures is grace of a very superior kind with hardly a trace of hardness or rigidity. Look at the Venus and Mars at the top of the picture—how gracefully they lean in opposite directions! Notice the dancing figures below, so supreme in their rhythmic movement and life. Where do you see the like elsewhere in Mantegna's work? They come nearer to the Apollo and the Muses by Giulio Romano in the Pitti. These are statuesque figures, if you like, but it is the statuesque of Sansovino, not Donatello. The Early Renaissance was only a promise of grace; the High Renaissance was its fulfilment. And where again in Mantegna's work do you see such bright, such brilliant, such cunning play of colour as here? Certainly not in the Madonna of Victory, done in 1496, when Mantegna was sixty-five. The drawing and colouring are almost un-

**

believable because so far beyond Mantegna's other work. This picture is freer than its companion (No. 1376), has more action in the figures, more colour in the robes, and is larger in the landscape and broader in the sky. It would seem a later and more mature work, though both belong in Mantegna's latest period. Finally, notice, through the arch of rock, the landscape so unlike anything we know in Mantegna's work. A superb picture.

1376. — *Wisdom Victorious Over Vice.* This and the preceding number were done for Isabella d'Este and are doubtless by the same hand. No. 1376 has not, however, the interest of No. 1375 in either colour or form. It is grotesque in the Vices but done with a larger feeling for bulk and roundness of body than is usual with Mantegna. The half-nude figure with the green drapery is very graceful, as also the two figures coming up to the left of her, and the pursuing Minerva in her helmet, breast-plate, and gorgeous garments. The arabesque of foliage, the water-plants in the foreground, the trees at the back are painted with great care, the leaves being smaller and the work finer than in No. 1375. The landscape with the sky, the hill at left, and also the figures in the clouds are perhaps more familiarly Mantegnesque than any other portion of the picture. The colour, as in the Minerva and the pursuing figures, is very charming. The draperies are superb in their revelation of form and their graceful line. It seems an earlier work than No. 1375, though doubtless done at the same time and for the same room at Mantua.

- N. N. — *St. Sebastian.* This picture is the Louvre's new Mantegna, brought here in 1912 from Au-

vergne. In 1481, Chiara Gonzaga, daughter of Federigo Gonzaga, married Gilbert, Count of Montpensier, and brought with her to the Montpensier Château, in Auvergne, this picture of St. Sebastian. Thence it went to the Church of Aigueperse, and from there to the Louvre. It is a work of commanding importance not only in size but in quality. It represents Mantegna—the painter of the statuesque and sculpturesque—superbly. It is drawn to the last degree of truth and fidelity. Nothing has escaped the eye or the brush—even the beard of the man at the bottom, the leaves of the trees, the little figures at the right, the marble reliefs of the arch, the stones of the building are all minutely done. And the large facts are just as truthfully, if largely, handled. Notice the comprehensive drawing of the figure, its truth of scale, of bulk, of weight. How positively it stands, or is bound with ropes, or is pierced with arrows! How true the column, capital, and arch at the back with all the fluting, patterns, and reliefs! How absolute the broken marbles at the bottom, or the fig-tree in leaf, or the distant mountain with houses and ruined temples, or the sky with those flaky-white clouds. And how beautiful, as well as true, it all is as line and colour! The white loin-cloth is kept down as grey as the marbles, and the white clouds are greyed, too, so that the figure shall have prominence. But the figure is only slightly higher in key. The harmony of the picture is perfect in its grey-silvery tone. It may not have been so planned originally, and it may have come to its present fineness of colour through age, but the fact that it is in distemper would suggest that some of it, at least, was designed.

At any rate, it is a perfect decorative harmony now. Across the gallery it looms large in its form and becomes like a pearl in its colour. What wonderful dignity, not only in the work, but in the conception of the suffering yet enduring saint standing against that beautiful broken fragment of architecture! Did Mantegna think to suggest here the light of Christianity in the saint outshining, even in death, the crumbling paganism of the ancient world? It does no harm to believe it. The work of art is no less wondrous for it. Go back through the double doors of the French Room and from there look at this Mantegna. How it holds at a distance and how the figure becomes lighter and stronger in flesh colour!

1379. **Maratta, Carlo.** *Portrait of Maria Rospigliosi.* By one of the Decadents, but not a bad portrait. It has too much of the simply pretty in the face, hands, and dress, but for the seventeenth century it is rather good work. Too much cleaned.
1381. **Marchesi, Girolamo.** *The Bearing of the Cross.* With some rather tragic action. The drawing severe and not too accurate, the colour cool.
1384. **Massone, Giovanni.** *Nativity.* A decorative, three-panelled altar-screen of much beauty in the colour as in the strange landscape. The only work in public galleries of this practically unknown painter. He was not a master of the first or even of the second rank, but, like all the church painters of his time, he had a decorative sense. Repainted, as may be seen in the head and hands of Joseph.
- Master of the Death of the Virgin.** See Cleve, Juste van.

N. N. Master of the Kinsfolk of the Virgin. *The Presentation in the Temple.* An altar-piece with much gold work in the ground and on the robes, very brilliant colours, and groups of people and angels composed in circles. It is not very well drawn, but it is sumptuous in colour and shows as a fine piece of decoration. Notice the robes of the high priest, the little choir-boys, the three little angels in the right-hand lower corner, the blue cherubim at the top.

1005A. Master of Moulins. *Magdalen and a Donor.*

* A graceful picture, whoever its painter. The drawing is very clear in its outlines but well understood and remarkable for giving the feeling of form. Notice this in the hands as well as in the figures and faces. The colour is excellent. What quality in the greens, browns, reds, and yellows! See the pearls below and also the gold work. The types are French, or at least Burgundian, with small suggestion of Van der Goes about them, by whom the Master of Moulins (Jean Perréal?) was supposed to have been influenced. The pictures of at least two different painters have been put down under this name in the European galleries. See the notes upon Nos. 1004 and 1005, under "French School."

2026. Memling, Hans. *The Madonna with Donors.*

* Known also as the Madonna of Jacques Floreins. A large Memling of considerable importance. The simplicity of the grouping on either side of the Madonna, the absence of much elaboration in the throne, the subdued architecture, the subordinated but very beautiful landscapes at the sides make up a perhaps more imposing Memling than is to be found elsewhere. The drawing of it is

quite beyond reproach, and as for the donors with their magnificent heads, where and when has Memling produced anything truer or stronger? The sentiment of the Madonna is not excessive and the colour of her robes is no more than enough to dominate the picture. In other respects, in tone and ensemble, the picture seems quite right, except that it has no envelope and is rather hard in the lines. That may be due to the fact that it has suffered from restorations. The surface has been repainted, and possibly the bloom-like flesh notes, the hard carpet, and the airless space are not Memling's.

N. N. — *Portrait of an Old Woman*. The head is still fine in characterisation though the picture has been much cleaned. It is Memling in both head and hands. It is the companion piece to No. 529c in the Berlin Gallery. Early work and recently acquired by the Louvre. See also the Head of a Monk in the same room, without a number, but attributed to Memling.

2024 } — *St. John Baptist and St. Mary Magdalen*.
 2025 } Probably the wings of a triptych. Fine in sentiment and good in workmanship. The Magdalen is in a beautiful brocade, and back of her are interesting small figures. Good landscapes in both panels with flowery patterns in the foreground. Memlingesque, at any rate, and quite good enough for the master.

2027. — *Marriage of St. Catherine and a Donor with John Baptist*. A diptych of considerable beauty of colour, especially in the left panel. The landscapes are very charming and the figures well

drawn. The style suggests Memling but is not quite positive enough for him.

2028. **Memling, Hans, School of. *Resurrection.*** A triptych with a St. Sebastian in the left panel and an Assumption of the Virgin in the right. A picture of some beauty and naïve charm. The figure of Christ is slight, but graceful, the angel in white charming, the soldiers in armour well drawn and painted, and at the back a broad, if crude, landscape. The architectural frame and the arabesque of fruit are minutely done. The St. Sebastian, repeating the motive of the Brussels picture (No. 291), is a fine figure, and the archers are striking in their colour as in their long, thin forms so suggestive of Thierry Bouts. Notice in the right panel the huddling of the crowd looking up and the figure of the Madonna disappearing in the clouds. The picture is of Memling inspiration and a fairly good one at that. Some one of his followers probably did it. But putting it down to the School of Memling seems to give it less importance than it deserves.
2457. **Metsu, Gabriel. *Woman Taken in Adultery.*** An unusually large Metsu, not bad in characterisation nor in composition, and quite beautiful in colour, in light, and in atmosphere. The robes are easily painted but the underlying drawing is a little weak.
2460. ——— ***The Music Lesson.*** A handsome little picture, well set and well painted all through. In many respects it is quite up to a Terborch.
2459. ——— ***An Officer Receiving a Young Woman.*** One
* of Metsu's first-rate pictures, excellent in drawing

as in painting, and with much fine colour. The upper-class life of Holland is here shown with dignity and distinction. How easily the lady sits, the officer stands! The background has darkened.

2462. ——— *A Dutch Woman*. With fat painting in the whites and much richness of colour. Metsu is not to be scheduled with the Dous and Netschers. He was a far better painter than they, and nearer to Terborch or Steen. See also No. 2463.

2464. ——— *Portrait of Admiral Tromp*. It is a commanding portrait in bright red. The face has suffered from some retouching. Metsu may have done this portrait, but there are no strong indications of his brush to be seen in it. It is effective work, nevertheless.

2030A. *Metsys, Quentin. Madonna and Child*. It has sentiment and feeling about it, though it looks like a school piece. The figures a little injured, perhaps.

2029. ——— *Banker and Wife*. Sharp in the drawing but true enough in the small details—even to the reflection in the glass in the foreground. It fails, however, to make an impressive picture. Most of these money-changer pictures have been put upon Quentin Metsys but do not belong to him. They are nearer to Romerswael or to Jean Metsys.

2466 } *Mierevelt, Michiel Jansz. Portraits of a Man*
 2467 } *and Woman*. True likenesses, no doubt, and done with exactness. The drawing is sharp and close, but the effect is fairly good. They are substantial portraits and not to be passed by because not of Rembrandtesque style and quality.

2055. **Mol, Pieter van.** *Head of a Young Man.* It is more striking than intrinsically fine. The drawing is loose and the painting rather rambling. It possibly belonged to a large picture from which it has been cut away.
1393. **Montagna, Bartolommeo.** *Ecce Homo.* A pathetic type of the Christ, done with some precision in the drawing, though it has been softened by retouching. The figure was originally articulated too much—in the shoulders, for instance. The brows and nose are harsh again, but there is a sense of reality about the head, the hair, the thorns, the shadows.
1394. ——— *Three Children Playing Instruments.* The catalogue title is misleading. The children are angels, a part cut away from an altar-piece, and they are playing for the glory of the Madonna that was once above them. Naïve and childlike in the types, with the unconscious air so often seen in the figures of Carpaccio, who possibly had some influence upon Montagna. A fine bit of colour, if leaving something to be desired in the way of good drawing.
- 1175 } **Moretto of Brescia.** *St. Bonaventura, St. Anthony, and Others.* Two panels and two saints in
1176 } each panel, with fine robes and rather strong faces. They have Moretto's silvery tone, but they do not represent him very well, being rather small and slight work for a man who revelled in large altar-pieces. The colour is his.
- 2480 } **Moro, Antonio.** *Portraits of Luis del Rio and*
2481 } *Wife.* They were probably the wings of an altar-piece originally. As portraits, they are very fine
* —finer, perhaps, than can be explained by the

name of Moro. They are superb illustrations of character in portraiture. The hands alone might make a picture even were the strong heads omitted. The coats of arms are a little spotty, and the backgrounds of landscape are now darkened so that the flowers about the woman hardly show at all, and the hills are plunged in gloom. (In the Salle Duchâtel, Hall V.)

2479. ——— *The Dwarf of Charles V.* Interesting in the theme. As for the painting, it is in an entirely different style from Nos. 2480 and 2481, though it is not impossible that all three pictures emanated from the same studio. The dwarf seems to be Moro's work.
1710. Murillo, Bartolomé Esteban. *The Birth of the Virgin.* This is perhaps as poor a work technically as Murillo ever executed. It should be studied for its bad drawing, false light, black shadows, and weak colour. The analysis of error is always an important factor in the establishment of truth. It is proper to state, however, that some critics and the public at large do not agree with this dictum and insist upon it that the picture is "one of the most charming in existence."
1717. ——— *Young Beggar.* It is fairly well drawn and painted and good in its effect of light. It does not improve on acquaintance—none of these beggar pictures do—but it is technically better than many of his Madonna pictures, though hard, dry, and rather colourless. Other examples of this genre are at Munich.
1708. ——— *Immaculate Conception.* Not so famous as No. 1709, but perhaps a trifle better done, though the sentiment of it is of the same insipid quality.

1713. ———*Holy Family*. A soft, sweet-faced, pretty Murillo that has little character, strength, colour, or drawing about it. But its popularity knows no bounds or limits. It is of the same stamp as the Immaculate Conception, No. 1709.
1709. ———*Immaculate Conception*. This is the Soult Murillo purchased in 1852 for the then enormous sum of 615,000 francs. It was at that time thought a marvellous creation, but has since fallen in critical esteem, until to-day it holds a very modest place. And rightly so. The sentiment is excessive, the Guido Reni face of the Madonna is insipid, the attitude affected (look at the hands), the colour merely pretty, the drawing rambling, loose, uncertain. The placing of the figure on the canvas and surrounding it with clouds and light is not badly done, but it is too weak for art, though it was probably effective at one time as religion.
1712. ———*Virgin with the Beads*. A much better-
* painted picture than Murillo's other Madonnas in the Louvre. The colour has a tang to it, and the Madonna does not look as though she were going to die in an ecstasy of sentimentality. It is so good a picture that one may be pardoned for entertaining the queer feeling that perhaps Murillo did not paint it, after all.
1716. ———*Miracle of San Diego*. A scattered processional composition of small merit. The central angels are graceful and have some rather pretty colour about them. The scenes at left and right are almost as much "out" of the composition as though on separate canvases.
1120. Niccolò Alunno. *Scenes from the Passion*. The predella of a picture painted in 1492. It is done

with spirit and "go," as notice the two little angels in the extreme left-hand compartment. The central panels again show action and life. The colour is now golden-brown enlivened with red, but it has doubtless become deepened by time. Apparently in good condition, genuine, and a picture to be studied by the student of early Umbrian art.

2498. **Ostade, Adriaen van.** *Interior of a Cottage.* To be studied in connection with the so-called Rembrandt, *The Carpenter's Shop*, No. 2542, across the room, for similarity of theme, treatment, and handling. Ostade possibly painted both pictures. See also in one of the side cabinets his charming interior, No. 2502, for further comparison. The so-called Rembrandt is, of course, the best of the three. That is why it was given to Rembrandt.
2497. — *The Fish Market.* An excellent piece of work with a large feeling for form and broad, comprehensive drawing. Notice the face and hands of the man. And the fish. What a crowd at the back! Nos. 2500 and 2503 by the same hand are also very well painted.
2513. **Ostade, Isaac van.** *A Pig Sty.* A companion piece, and almost a replica so far as theme and treatment go, is shown in the Brussels Gallery (No. 357) under the name and signature of Paul Potter. The Brussels picture is, like this one in the Louvre, a very good example of the work of Isaac van Ostade. See also No. 2510.
1399. **Palma Vecchio.** *Adoration of Shepherds.* The picture is said to have two false signatures of Titian in the foreground. There is no question about its being by Palma, and before it was flayed in the clean-

ing room it must have been a picture of considerable beauty. Notice how the little figure of the Christ Child and the Madonna's hands holding him have been injured. The faces are just as badly repainted, barring that of the kneeling shepherd, who seems less injured than the others. What large, full drawing of drapery and what richness of colour still! And notice the breadth of treatment in the landscape. A small, half-obliterated picture is hanging on the brick wall at the back.

1400. **Palmezzano, Marco.** *The Dead Christ.* With mourning angels holding the arms. A hard piece of drawing and modelling, but rather good in colour, and with a nice suggestion of landscape. Notice the flatness of the fingers, the folding of the drapery, the flint-like rocks at the top.

1401. **Panetti, Domenico.** *Nativity.* A very simple composition of large masses and few objects and much the better for its simplicity. The drawing of the drapery is mannered, the hands are too large, the brick arch is very flat, the Child's bed very hard. But there is richness of colour. And what good sentiment without sentimentality!

1048. **Perréal, Jehan (Jean de Paris).** *Madonna and Child with Donors.* Here is a picture that approaches the Van Eyck School in the Madonna with the large but crinkled drapery, the composition, and the minuteness of the details. But the types, the robes in their cut and pattern, the architecture are different. The picture comes from northern France, in all probability, but whether by Perréal is not so easily determined. We have no authentic work by him to judge by, unless we accept him as identical with the Master

of Moulins. A fine picture all through. The Madonna is lovely and the donors quiet, dignified, truthful, excellent in every way. Notice the beautiful detail of the patterns, borders, flowers, and the good colour.

1566. **Perugino, Pietro. *St. Paul*.** With some indications of its being merely a school piece, though generally accepted as by the master's brush. The hands, the outlines of the neck, the screen at the back are not exactly Peruginesque. It is careless work.
1565. — ***Holy Family*.** A much scrubbed and stained Perugino, but still showing his round faces, his warm colouring, and his Umbrian sentiment. It makes no attempt at cleverness in composition, but gives the figures in a row and rather posing for their pictures. It is not an early Perugino; the Madonna is becoming a little heavy in the jowl, and the colours are deeper and richer than in his earlier work.
1564. — ***Holy Family*.** It is a circular composition in which the lines of the figures supplement and complement the lines of the frame. There are "eyes" in the drapery, and the hands are somewhat sharply articulated in the joints. The types and also the colour are very attractive. The beautiful angels at the top are pure, if thin, in sentiment, and the landscape possesses the same attenuated feeling. An early work.
- 1566A. — ***St. Sebastian*.** "A body belonging to the Renaissance containing a soul belonging to the Middle Ages"—to quote Taine. And both of them are beautiful. Here is Perugino's drawing at its best—save perhaps in the chin. The figure

*

is flat, abbreviated, a little hard; but expressive, true, and withal graceful or approaching grace. What a serene sky and still landscape! And what architecture for the framing of the figure! A fine picture. The head and shoulders show in another version at the Hermitage (No. 1938), possibly a copy.

1567. — *Combat Between Love and Chastity*. Like
 * No. 1261, this picture is to be regarded more as a landscape with figures than as figures with a landscape. It is the ensemble of it that counts, and the figures are merely graceful lines or spots of colour in the scheme, though they undoubtedly influence that scheme greatly. It is not so very certain that Perugino did these figures. The landscape is more like him, and very charming it is, too. Without being so clever or so elaborate as the Costa (No. 1261), it is warmer in colour and more attractive in light and air. But even the landscape is somewhat unusual for Perugino. An excellent decorative piece that probably came out of the Perugino workshop.
1573. Perugino, School of. *Madonna and Child Surrounded by Cherubim*. A slight affair. Another panel of the same kind and by the same hand, in the Budapest Gallery (No. 83), there ascribed to Pinturicchio—a closer guess than Perugino. It is probably by Antonio da Viterbo.
1414. Pesellino, Francesco. *St. Francis Receiving the Stigmata and Sts. Cosmo and Damian Curing a Sick Man*. Two small panels that possess much depth and richness of colour. Notice the bright colour at the right, the landscape at the left. The panels probably belonged originally to the predella

of an altar-piece by Fra Filippo in Santa Croce, Florence. Other parts of the predella are in the Academy at Florence.

1415. — *The Dead Christ and Two Legendary Scenes.* The two nude figures hanging and the saint looking on at the right have some feeling for form and are realistic. The drawing is not accurate, but the colour has some strength. The attribution may be questioned. The work belongs somewhere in the Umbrian School of Perugino.

1416A } **Piero di Cosimo.** (Attributed to.) *Marriage*
 1416B } *of Thetis and Peleus and Triumph of Venus.* Two decorative panels done perhaps for some wedding chest. And handsomely done. They are perhaps too cunning in drawing for Piero, too graceful in line, too delicate in colour. Botticelli's influence is very apparent everywhere. In 1416B the figure in the shell was probably inspired by Botticelli's Venus, as the figures at the extreme right by the Graces in Botticelli's Spring. Notice that the nude figures at the left are much rounder in contours than is customary with Piero. Handsome panels and of some interest in art history. Mr. Berenson gives them to Alunno di Domenico.

1417. **Pinturicchio, Bernardo.** *Madonna and Child.* It gives one but a small notion of Pinturicchio, though perhaps genuine enough. It has some nice sentiment with ornamental gold work, but Pinturicchio should be studied at Siena.

1352. **Piombo, Sebastiano del.** *The Visitation.* This picture is now in bad shape, due to its transference to canvas and repainting, but it still suggests Sebastiano's types, figures, draperies, and colours.

The robes and figures are largely done and well drawn. The warm sky reflects the reds and yellows of the foreground. The flesh notes are greyed.

- 1422 bis. **Pisanello (Vittore Pisano).** *Portrait of a Princess d'Este.* This is probably a portrait of Ginevra d'Este. The head and neck are flat, and have possibly been flattened somewhat by cleaning, but the picture is still a masterpiece of characterisation. There is nothing pretty or even regular about the features, but one sees here youth and innocence, with repose, dignity, even nobility of presence. The hair has been plucked from the forehead and eyebrows, as was the fashion of the day. The robe is superb, and superb also the flowery pattern at the back, every note of which is in perfect harmony. This is art of a very distinguished kind. Perhaps it requires an acquired taste to appreciate it, but there is no doubt about its high quality. Its decorative content in such things as the beautiful outline of the face, or the splendid dress hanging from the shoulder, or the drawing and painting of the flowers is sufficient in itself to indicate its rank as art.

2526. **Potter, Paulus.** *Horses at the Door of a Cottage.* A very good picture by some second-rate Little Dutchman, but not by Paul Potter. It is too easily handled, especially in the man and the cottage, for Potter. The signature on the chimney speaks for itself, and speaks rather loudly at that. The same signature is on a pig-sty picture at Brussels, by Isaac van Ostade. After the supply of Potters was exhausted it seems Van Ostade was fair game for those who wanted Potters. See the note on the Brussels picture (No. 357).

2527. — *The Meadow*. A large Potter, similar in composition to the Young Bull at The Hague, and in the same style of painting. It is hard in drawing, dry in handling, with no colour, spirit, or life to hold it up. The sky has been cleaned to death. The cattle never were alive.
2528. — *Horse at Large*. A picture with more air and envelope than Potter usually obtained, but even so, not a remarkable work in any way.
2529. — *Woods at The Hague*. This is Potter at his best in this gallery, but the work is in every way different from No. 2526.
741. Poussin, Nicolas. *Diogenes Casting Away His Bowl*.
* The title is only an excuse for showing a classic landscape of far reach and much strength. Poussin never went beyond this in landscape, and some of his latter-day compatriots in the Fontainebleau-Barbizon School never equalled it. There is no sentiment about it, and it lacks in spontaneity, but it has style, proportion, unity. The scheme of light is low in key, but it is well sustained throughout. The picture is perfectly held together. It is a depth and not a flat surface, and has air, distance, and a real sky overhead. The trees are of classic variety, but majestic, the hills solid and substantial, the distant Athens quite true in light. Fore-ground and distance are one and the same earth, and the light comes from one source—the sun. The colour is dull, corresponding to the light. A well-made picture.
- N. N. — *Poetic Inspiration*.
* A newly acquired Poussin with figures of life size. It has much excellence of drawing and far more light and colour than

usual with Poussin. It is now his most considerable figure picture in the Louvre—his best, perhaps.

734. ——— *Shepherds in Arcadia*. A picture famous for its story but not for its art. It is, however, a fair example of Poussin's good drawing, hot flesh, and crude blues and reds. His other figure pictures, with the exception of the Poetic Inspiration, are no better than this, and may be passed without mention.

737. ——— *Ruth and Boaz*. Almost all of the Poussins are dull in their lighting. This picture is a good example of his almost unbelievable light. No grain-field at midday could show such darkness. The landscape, otherwise than in light, is good, and the costumes are not bad as colour spots. His Garden of Eden (No. 736) and the Deluge (No. 709) are of the same lightless variety.

1504. **Raphael Sanzio.** *St. Michael Overcoming Satan*. This picture was restored as early as 1530 by Primaticcio, and has undergone many cleanings, restorations, and transferences since, so that one can hardly say what is Raphael in it and what is restoration. The design is probably Raphael's but the execution that of pupils—primarily, Giulio Romano. It is not a satisfactory work and does not represent Raphael at all well. The action is excited, the drapery flutters out, obviously to fill space, the wings are hardly sustaining, and the spear is part of an academic model's pose. The landscape is not Raphael's, and the colour is now more the restorer's work than the master's or the pupil's. The light is dim and wants in warmth. It is not worth while forming an idea of Raphael from this picture.

1496. — *La Belle Jardinière*. The exaggerated reputation of this picture is hardly justified by its quality. It is not Raphael at his best by any means. It is early and (for him) rather immature work, but it is not wanting in skill or charm. The composition is pyramidal and the drawing acceptable but not wonderful. The placing of the group in the landscape is very good, and the landscape itself, with its feeling of space, is excellent. The hands of the children are not well done, the feet of the Virgin are copied after the feet in Leonardo's picture (No. 1598), the flesh painting is somewhat pasty, like Lorenzo di Credi's, the handling is smooth and rather pretty as in the Madonna's hair and robe. The colour is not remarkable and the foliage in the foreground is rather overdone. The best part of the picture is the composition—the placing of the figure in space—and the landscape at the back, though there is, of course, considerable grace in the turning of contours and the drawing of the vestments. As for the sentiment, it is not strong. Notice the apparent malformation of the left shoulder, due to cleaning; also the Child's left arm.
1498. — *Holy Family of Francis I*. The drawing is graceful in the circling lines of the Madonna, in the swing of the red-gowned figure through the oval of the blue overdress, in the angel with the flowers, in the St. Anne and St. Joseph. All the figures are grouped about the Child, who is springing eagerly toward his mother. There is movement everywhere except in the St. Joseph with the fine head, who represents the repose of the group in contrast to the hurrying angel. The surface is smooth; the colour is now yellow and hot. The

picture has been over-cleaned and repainted. It has also been relined. It is signed on the edge of the Virgin's cloak, which is suspicious. A real Raphael never needs a signature, but a school piece usually does. This is of the latter character. It is more like Giulio Romano than Raphael, having Giulio's drawing and mannered flesh colour. Carry it in your eye into the long gallery, and compare it with the Joanna of Aragon (No. 1507) for the flesh colour and smooth surface as shown in the head and neck of the Madonna. No doubt Raphael designed the picture, though he is not to be judged wholly by it.

1505. — *Portrait of Baldassare Castiglione*. If this picture did not bear the magic name of Raphael, should we spend much time looking at it or marvelling over its workmanship? Is its workmanship so very good? Beginning at the cap, is it so well drawn or so well marked by light and shade? Is the face, with its commonplace brow, its hard eyelids, and its matty, painty beard remarkable in any way as a study of character, or as drawing, or as painting? The disposition of the costume, is that easy, restful, or is the coat badly drawn in the sleeves and shoulders, flattened in patches, hard in the edges, and wholly lacking in repose? Does it give much idea of the figure beneath it, or is there much of a figure there? The hands are over-cleaned and are not exactly bad in drawing, but were they ever very good? Finally, what about the colour of this picture and the atmospheric envelope—are they good or are they indifferent? The picture has been repainted in the face and much restored, but was probably never a very fine portrait even though Raphael did it.

1497. — *The Madonna of the Blue Diadem.* This comes perilously near to being a dinner-plate picture with its pretty faces, its porcelain surfaces, and its harsh colouring. Look at the blues with their positive falsity of value and want of tone. And what awkwardness in the hand and arm with the veil! What bad drawing in the figure of the Madonna, especially in the shoulders and knees! And is this Raphael's feeling for space? Is this his landscape? Did he draw that Child on that dreadful blue drapery? One may venture to doubt. It is hardly conceivable that even Giulio Romano could do this. And yet, probably he did.
1499. — *The Holy Family.* It will not answer for Raphael. It is some kind of school piece, cold in colour though hot in flesh, with little to commend it as art. The head of the St. Anne reappears in the head No. 1509 bis, which see.
- 1509 bis. — *Head of St. Elizabeth.* This head appears in the small picture, No. 1499 here shown and also in a large canvas by Giulio Romano at the Madrid Gallery (No. 300). Giulio and his school were probably responsible for all three pictures.
1500. — *St. John the Baptist in the Wilderness.* There is a repetition of this picture in the Uffizi at Florence. Each is claimed as the original, but Raphael probably was guiltless of them both. The landscape, light and shade, and flesh colour are not Raphaellesque. The picture is possibly, but not certainly, by Sebastiano del Piombo.
1501. — *St. Margaret.* This picture has been much cleaned and restored, first by Primaticcio and afterward by cleaning-room celebrities. It is in bad condition, and one can now only guess at its

painter. It is not likely that Raphael ever saw it. A variant of it by Giulio Romano is at Vienna (No. 31).

1502. — *St. Michael*. Probably not by Raphael, and a good argument might be made to the effect that it is not even an Italian picture. But the panel is hardly worth enough as art to warrant discussion.
1503. — *St. George*. This has little more value as art than No. 1502 and is far removed from the astonishing or the wonderful. Yet it is very likely a genuine Raphael, done when he was a boy. The little figure of St. Sabra at the back is better than the saint on his wooden horse. The landscape is very good.
1506. — *Portrait of a Young Man*. Long known, copied, photographed, and engraved as Raphael's own portrait by himself. The "own portrait" notion has now been abandoned, but the attribution of the picture to Raphael still sticks. If Raphael had one technical excellence above another, it was that of good drawing. Such being the case, how are we to understand the very badly drawn hand and wrist so much in evidence in this picture? And the queer cocked eyes, the nose, and the mouth, the badly drawn figure and costume? Also the want of atmosphere, with the overmodelled head falling out of the picture-frame? Also the different-from-Raphael handling of the hair and flesh, the wholly alien-from-Raphael scheme of colour? The picture was probably painted by Bacchiacca, as Morèlli pointed out years ago. Poor Raphael! If he has such pictures as this hung about his neck, he will hardly hold his place in the empyrean.

1507. ——— *Joanna of Aragon*. A very good portrait,
* but somewhat mannered in the hands and perhaps too elaborate in the costume. The colour is rich, the palace background ornate, the handling apparently facile. The catalogue quotes Vasari to the effect that Raphael made only the head from life and Giulio Romano completed it; but recently published correspondence intimates that the study of the head was made by a pupil. In other words, the portrait is what is nowadays called a workshop portrait—something executed by pupils. But that goes to show that a workshop picture or a Giulio Romano is not necessarily either a swindle or a failure. This is neither the one nor the other. It probably pleased those for whom it was executed, as it pleases many people to-day. It has much to commend it. Compare the head and shoulders for flesh colour and contours with the Madonna in the Holy Family of Francis I (No. 1498), also executed by Giulio Romano.
1508. ——— *Portraits of Two Men*. There is no reason whatever to think it by Raphael. It is doubtful that it is either a Florentine or an Umbrian picture. Critics have attributed it to Sebastiano, to Pontormo, to Giulio Romano. It is not wonderful in any way. On the contrary, it is rather heavy, both mentally and technically.
1509. **Raphael**. (Attributed to.) *Apollo and Marsyas*. A picture that almost any one of half a dozen painters in the Umbrian country might have done. It does not speak for Raphael so much as for his teachers and elders—say Perugino. And yet it might be by Manni or even Aspertini. It is a graceful enough composition with a good Umbrian landscape.

2536. **Rembrandt van Ryn. *Angel Raphael Leaving Tobias.*** What a beautiful envelope of air and shadow in which the figures are happily placed! How well done the old man kneeling, the frightened figures at the door, the dog, the setting of the house! Also the flying angel, with his lovely hair and wings! The picture is indeed charming and quite worthy of Rembrandt for all the hard drawing of the hands and legs. It has some look of Bol about it, but it is probably a genuine enough Rembrandt, done in his grey-golden period.

2537. **—*The Good Samaritan.*** This picture was written about by Fromentin, some years ago, at some length and with much enthusiasm. The present generation looks at it with perhaps less admiration. This may be due to less certainty as to who did the picture. It is likely a picture in which Eeckhout had a hand. Compare it with the Eeckhout across the gallery (No. 2364). Begin with the similarity of light, the central spot of white, the likeness of the man with the turban in both pictures, the repeated red cap, the drawing of the hands, sleeves, coats. They are not identical, but are they not so similar as to point to a possibility? They were done in point of time some years apart, for the No. 2364 is much smoother work. But all that Fromentin said about this picture, its piteous subject and the pathos of it is quite true. It is a picture of merit. The distribution of shadow is disturbing, and no one knows precisely whence comes the light. The colour is Rembrandtesque and rich.

2538. **—*St. Matthew.*** It does not follow that every loaded and thumbled canvas with foxy colouring is a late Rembrandt. His pupils stumbled and

boggled with a loaded brush more than he. They were imitating his failures as well as his successes. The angel in this picture is the same as you may see in Bol's picture in the Amsterdam Gallery (No. 552) and also in the Rembrandt (which is by Bol) in the Berlin Gallery (No. 828). This model was continually used by Bol, but that does not conclusively prove that he painted this picture. It is probably a studio picture, like No. 2555, in which Bol or Eeckhout may have had a hand. Other painters—Rubens, Raphael, Bellini—were helped by pupils and sent out composite works under their names and often signed them in the bargain. Why not Rembrandt? Yet how often in the long lists of Rembrandts in public galleries do you find one assigned to the school?

1539. ——— *Pilgrims at Emmaus*. Of much emotional feeling and great pathos. It is a poor, mean-looking Amsterdam Jew who figures as the Christ. The face is transfigured by suffering, has sad eyes and blackened lips, and speaks the Christ of the tomb. The phosphorescent halo of death is about the head and a suggestion of the tomb is given in the architecture at the back. The wonder of the disciples as they recognise the One who is breaking bread is well given in facial looks, upraised hands, and shrinking bodies. Even the boy who is bringing in a dish has a frightened air. The figures are very well set in their aerial envelope. What an envelope it is, with the deep, mysterious recess at the back! What luminous shadows are here! And how the table, chairs, and dishes are drawn! More than that it is not technically remarkable. It has little brilliancy of colour and carries largely by its emotional significance.

2540 } ———*Philosophers in Meditation.* Small pictures
 2541 } over which, in the past, there has been some spill-
 ing of good printer's ink with no very marked re-
 sults. The pictures are not wonderful. In fact,
 one may be heretical enough to think that some one
 like Salomon Koninck or Dou might have painted
 them. It is not affirmed that either of them did,
 but it may be reasserted that there is nothing
 wonderful about the pictures, whoever did them;
 and further that there is no strong indication of
 Rembrandt having done them. He was not given
 to the painting of such small material.

2542. ———*The Carpenter's Shop.* And when, pray, did
 Rembrandt come down to doing a pretty, Italian-
 faced Madonna like this, seated in an interior that
 has a window reminding one of the windows by
 Adriaan van Ostade? It is a very good picture,
 but why Rembrandt? See the Van Ostade across
 the room (No. 2498), for a similar theme done in a
 similar manner, though not so well done. Ostade
 repeated the theme again and again. See another
 example in one of the side cabinets (No 2507).
 One can form his own conclusions.

2543. ———*Venus and Love.* The learned director of the
 * Berlin Gallery is quoted in the catalogue as recog-
 nising in this picture the likeness of Hendrickje
 Stoffels and her daughter Cornelia, but one would
 like to know when, where, and how the present
 generation became acquainted with her features
 or those of her daughter. In the Berlin Gallery
 she is recognised as the model of No. 828B, quite a
 different portrait from the person in No. 2547 here
 in the Louvre, which is also asserted with equal posi-
 tiveness to be a likeness of the unfortunate Hen-

drickje. Now here in No. 2543 we have still another likeness of her. Once more we catch a glimpse of how history is made, and begin to understand why it requires rewriting every ten years to keep it up to date. As for the picture itself (that is, No. 2543), it is good in colour and nice in the little Cupid. With a great many things about it that do not suggest Rembrandt, as, for example, the subject, the types, the hands (especially those of the Cupid), the dark shadows, and, above all, the trail of the brush. Compare it with the handling of the Flayed Ox (No. 2548). It seems a very good picture that belongs perhaps nearer to Bernaert Fabritius than any one else. See the notes on the Rembrandts at Berlin and at The Hague.

2544. — *Portrait of an Old Man*. A portrait of no great power or charm, no spontaneity or verve. Even the loaded forehead is done with great care and timidity. It is rather tame all through, as though the work of a copyist rather than the master. It originally had a grey tone but is now yellow with varnish.
2545. — *Portrait of a Young Man*. To be accepted with a grain of salt. There is a weakness about the face and a blackness of the shadows that are not Rembrandt's. Besides, the surface is smooth for Rembrandt's golden period. It is possibly a school work.
2546. — *Portrait of a Man*. Said by Michel (quoted in the catalogue) to be a repetition or copy of the portrait at Cassel. It is neither better nor worse than the Cassel picture, and neither of them is a thing of great pith or moment in art. But this is not a copy. It is the original work of some Rembrandt follower.

2547. — *Portrait of a Woman*. Again we have the assertion that this is the portrait of Hendrickje Stofels. See the note to No. 2543. The picture has much fine colour of a golden tone, transparent shadows, and some very good modelling. It must be taken for a Rembrandt of the late golden period, though it does not in every way agree with his work at that time. It is handsomely done, with good drawing, especially in the eyes and the turn of the cheeks and chin, and in good pervasive light. The figure protrudes a bit and does not keep within its envelope as it should. It is a late work, and a little after the manner of the Young Woman with a Pink, at Cassel (No. 238). It has been cleaned too much. The cap at the top and the little red lines at the side of it seem to have been painted in afterward.
2548. — *A Flayed Ox*. This is a *tour de force*, done for the pure love of manipulating pigment and getting a colour effect. Several of the old Dutch painters tried the same subject, but none arrived so successfully as Rembrandt. It is a marvellous piece of painting in which the fatty quality of the pigment seems to reproduce in modelling the fat of the beef itself. It is largely painted with a palette-knife or a thumb, and is not kneaded and amended but hit the first time. This was in 1655, when we are given to understand his handling was heavy, as accounting for works of a heavy nature put down to his name. There is here not the slightest sign of failure or heaviness in the work. It is certainty itself. What a piece of colour! And what a luminous shadowed background! It is a painter's picture and superb.

2549. ——— *A Woman Bathing*. Once more with this picture we have the allegation that it is a likeness of Hendrickje Stoffels (see the note to No. 2543), with a eulogy on the loveliness of the drawing by Doctor Bode. As for its being Hendrickje Stoffels, it is much more likely to be a plain studio model employed by Rembrandt and his pupils, or by others. In fact, one might see the same model in this room in the picture put down to Drost (No. 2559A). It is the same type, varied in the painting by the different views of the two painters. The type appears again in the *Woman Bathing* (No. 54) in the National Gallery, London. As for the drawing, the learned doctor is quite right. It is quite a remarkable figure, if a little coarse. One cannot feel so sure that Rembrandt did the long-fingered hands and the rather black shadows. Nor can one be so sure, as some others, that Rembrandt always did the whole of his pictures and without the help of his pupils. This picture is not difficult to reconcile with certain pictures attributed to Rembrandt, such as the *Woman Bathing*, in the National Gallery (No. 54), a picture in reality painted by Eeckhout. It is easier to see Eeckhout in the Louvre picture than it is to see Rembrandt. Across the room is an Eeckhout (No. 2364), with a robe about the seated figure that will match the robe of this bathing woman very well. It is practically the same robe, and appears again in the London picture. This picture also agrees very well with the *Good Samaritan* (No. 2537), which is probably an Eeckhout also. But Eeckhout or Rembrandt, it is a fine piece of work. To be very frank, it is almost too fine in drawing for Eeckhout, and not fine enough for Rembrandt, not

luminous enough or powerful enough, and too hard in the drawing and the surface. The small figure (No. 2550) is probably by the same hand that did this No. 2549.

2551. ——— *Portrait of a Man*. The face has no great strength to it, though well enough done. The hair, cap, and coat are somewhat mauled and tortured, and the shadows are rather dark. It is probably some pupil's performance or a shop piece done in the Rembrandt shop. Possibly by the painter of No. 2545.
2553. ——— *Portrait of the Painter*. A straightforward portrait, with nothing either very good or very bad about it. The chain is overloaded with pigment. The colour is turning to gold, though it has been helped somewhat in this case by much oil and varnish. The picture is of about the same quality as Nos. 2552 and 2554. They are none of them of pronounced Rembrandt origin.
2554. ——— *Portrait of the Painter*. Again there is nothing remarkable about this portrait of the painter. It is not even spirited, and if it could be seen close at hand it might prove merely a pupil's work, or an old copy.
- 2541A. ——— *A Hermit Reading*. This picture is probably not by Rembrandt, but possibly by Dou or some one of his ilk. Not to go out of the Louvre for illustration, examine Dou at second hand in the work of his imitator, Brekelenkam, in his picture (No. 2336), *A Monk Reading*. It is among the Dutch pictures in one of the small side cabinets. The subject is not only similar, but notice, if you will, the same bend forward of the head, the same drawing of the skull, the same drawing of the hands

with an emphasis upon the knuckles, the same scheme of light. See also the Dous like Nos. 2354 and 2357 in the side cabinets, or No. 2356 across the room. The Dou in the Wallace Collection, London (No. 1771), *A Hermit at Prayer*, shows a similar model and a similar drawing of the hands. The same subject is seen again in the Amsterdam Museum (No. 797), and in the Prado, Madrid, (No. 2078). It was a favourite theme of Dou's. This Hermit in the Louvre is a very good little picture, but not in Rembrandt's style. The modelling and handling are quite different from his work.

2555. — *Rembrandt in Advanced Years*. This is supposed to be Rembrandt as an old man. The portrait is signed and dated 1660, and therefore belongs to about the same year as the portrait of Rembrandt in the National Gallery, London (No. 221). The question at once comes up, could or did Rembrandt see himself in two different ways in that year? There is small doubt that both portraits were intended for the same character (supposed to be Rembrandt), but how could a man looking at himself in a mirror see himself as two different men? In this Louvre portrait he has an apish face, a badly spread nose, a right eye out of drawing, a double chin badly drawn, a mouth askew, a neck that is not believable, and indicated hands under a blackish shadow. The total result is quite different from the London picture—so different that we question if Rembrandt (or any one else) did both pictures. The shadows in this Louvre picture are blackish all through, the handling heavy, save in the white cap; but the figure has envelope and setting, and from across the gallery it looks convincing in its tonal effect.

One returns to it, however, with the feeling that this is by some member of the school, using the master or some person of this face as a model. It is only by such a hypothesis that one can account for the twenty-odd portraits of Rembrandt, each one looking so different from the others. No painter could do himself twenty times, with twenty points of view, in twenty ways. The tendency of every painter is not to vary, but to repeat a formula. That is the one thing that enables critics and connoisseurs to attribute pictures with any certainty. Moreover, repetition was peculiar to Rembrandt. His power, though penetrating, was of a limited range. He repeated himself again and again, more frequently, perhaps, than did Rubens, or Titian, or Raphael.

2555A. — *Supper at Emmaus*. How is it possible to put this *Supper at Emmaus* down to the same hand that did the similar subject in No. 2539? This work (No. 2555A) belongs possibly to Bernaert Fabritius. It agrees with his pictures at Darmstadt, and disagrees with Rembrandt's pictures anywhere and everywhere.

1448. **Reni, Guido.** *Magdalen*. One of Guido's pretty *Magdalens* with a pulpy face, boneless hands, and newly washed and perfumed hair. Look at the weak drawing of the chin and neck. This is a little sweeter than usual for Guido, and looks as though it might be an old copy.

1725. **Ribera, Josef.** (Lo Spagnoletto). *The Club-footed Man*. Something in the category of Velasquez's dwarfs that, indeed, might pass for an early Velasquez with many people. An excellent piece of characterisation and a good piece of

painting. How well the head is drawn and the brown clothes painted! And what excellence of shadowed colour! The sky and landscape are fine. It is a notable Ribera. (In the La Caze Collection.)

1722. — *The Entombment*. A blackish picture with some large grace in the arms and legs of the dead figure. A rather good Ribera in its drawing.
1482. **Rosselli, Cosimo.** *Madonna in Glory*. The picture is attributed to Rosselli, but the angels indicate Botticini, and the St. Mary of Egypt at the left, with the long, enveloping hair, is after Lorenzo di Credi. It is a graceful oval composition, rather violent in colour, and not particularly well done. The painter of it was some Florentine eclectic, who helped himself to whatever was good in the art of his contemporaries, and yet made a poor combination of those qualities, as usually happens to imitators and eclectics.
2075. **Rubens, Peter Paul.** *The Flight of Lot*. It is
* little more than a finished study, but it has the merit of being intact, and with no repainting of any importance upon it. The composition is processional, and gives the sense of movement, of flight. The drawing is flawless, and the colour is excellent. Done in 1625, it is a little different in its brush-work from his earlier style. Notice the beauty of the two angels, the depth of shadow about the finely drawn architecture, the fine suggestion of landscape. Carry the landscape in your eye to No. 2118 and notice the difference.
2077. — *Adoration of Magi*. Done for a Brussels church about 1627 and a repetition of a theme

Rubens did several times, notably in the large panel in the Antwerp Gallery. This picture smacks of the workshop, and was undoubtedly done in large part by pupils. The flesh now lacks the Rubens tang, and the robes do not show his colour quality. Notice the coarse, cheap way in which the hair and beards are done.

2078. ——— *The Madonna*. The Madonna is surrounded by a throng of putti, gracefully arranged, and drawn with much skill. It has good colour and still shows the brush-work of Rubens. It is a fairly good picture to appeal to if there is ever any doubt about this painter's early handling. His later handling is to be studied in the Médicis Series, specifically in No. 2099.
2116. ——— *A Tourney*. The landscape alone indicates that it is not Rubens's work, even if the drawing in the foreground figures did not confirm such an impression. There is a fine golden tone to this picture, and it is not a bad work, but some Rubens follower did it and some restorer repainted it. It is thought by writers on art to be entirely by Rubens's hand. Compare it with the Flight of Lot (No. 2075), to see how little they agree with each other—that is, the pictures, not the writers on art.
2079. ——— *Madonna Amidst Flowers*. The flowers were done apparently by Brueghel, and the Madonna is said to be by Rubens, though it has only a superficial resemblance to his work. It is well enough done, but it is not done in a Rubens way. Look at the hands, the hair, the colour. It is probably some school piece, though documentary evidence points to Rubens as the painter.

2082. — *Christ on the Cross*. A large and simple
* pyramidal composition, with some feeling and good drawing. The figure of Christ is not, perhaps, so refined or noble as the Christ on the Cross, at Munich (No. 748), but there is a great deal of realistic truth about it. The Magdalen in her gold-hued silk is at once pitiful and beautiful and the Madonna is majestic. Though too square in form, the John is effective as colour—the red being dominant. The landscape is light except in the sky, where Rubens repeats the note of blood-red in the red of the moon as he repeats the blue of the robe of the Madonna in the blue of the distant hills. Early work, done in 1615, with the help of pupils.
2084. — *Thomyris and Cyrus*. A version, with variations, of a picture said to be in the Darnley Collection, England. The Louvre picture is later and has been restored in the faces and hands of the women. Originally it may have been a good Rubens, but there are indications that the work was helped out by pupils, if indeed they did not do the greater part of it. Notice the frail heads and necks, the bad hands.
2111. — *Portrait of Baron de Vicq*. A substantial
* portrait done without much artistic feeling. It was perfunctorily executed for Baron de Vicq in recognition of his services in securing for the painter the Marie de Médicis Series of paintings now in the Louvre. It does not seem to have cost Rubens anything, either in emotional feeling or technical labour, but it is, nevertheless, a very good portrait.
2112. — *Portrait of Elizabeth of France*. In reality a portrait of Anne of Austria, wife of Louis XIII.

It is a very delicately executed portrait and is almost fragile in its thinness. Notice the small hands. The painting is quite as thin, quite as small. A decorative picture but not a strong one. It has the appearance of a careful and rather pretty copy. A varied version is in the Prado at Madrid.

2108. ——— *Portrait of Marie de Médicis as Bellona.* This was something done to please the Queen rather than the painter. It is a bit bombastic in its pose, its heaped-up armour, its angels. It is all very cleverly done, but it is not satisfying. It is splendour for splendour's sake and not as an incident of an event or a reign. The robes are a bit uneasy, but how beautifully they are painted! And they were probably done, too, not by Rubens, but by his assistants.

2107 } ——— *Portraits of Jeanne d'Autriche and François*
2106 } *de Médicis.* In any other gallery these portraits might cut quite a figure, but with several other Rubens portraits and the many brilliant pictures of the Médicis Series near at hand they seem perfunctory and a little tame. The lady's portrait seems the better. They were painted for the gallery of the Luxembourg.

2113. ——— *Helene Fourment and Children.* This is a beautiful poetic canvas done with much feeling and tenderness. In the design and colour it is entirely right, though the work was never pushed beyond the first inspiration and was never completed except in the faces. The background and the garments are merely rubbed in with sepia. But it was carried far enough. Just as it stands, it is tender but spirited, romantic but true, indicative

of things not seen, but sure as regards what is seen. A charming work that the student should study closely in the hair, the hats, the dresses for Rubens's handling in 1636—his late manner. His hand never failed; it was always sure and right. Notice the delicate shadow under the hat, the plume, the boy's head and cap, the beautiful whites.

2114. ——— *Portrait of a Lady*. It is probably a portrait of Suzanne Fourment, sister of Helene, who appears as a model in No. 2093 of the Médicis Series, and also in the Chapeau de Poil (No. 852), National Gallery, London. This portrait looks very smooth and a trifle sweet for Rubens in, say, 1624, but there is little doubt that he did it. The handling is his.
2115. ——— *The Kermesse*. This is a picture that has life,
 * bustle, and movement about it. It is not a bad picture by any means, but is it by Rubens? There is small indication in the types, the colour, the drawing, the composition, the landscape of his handiwork. Notice the way the high lights are plastered on the foreheads and the hair; and notice the loose drawing everywhere, particularly in the hands. Was Rubens such a poor draughtsman as that? Compare this work piece by piece, article by article, with No. 2075, and you will find much that cannot be reconciled except by putting down this Kermesse picture as a Rubens school piece. In spite of all the rhapsodies written about it, it possibly belongs among the works of some follower of the master. Again let it be said that it is by no means a bad work. The landscape is really very fine—it has great depth, sweep, and a good sky. But the work is probably that of some one follower or assistant of Rubens, who later on became more

careless than in this picture, and then did such work as the Madonna with St. George (No. 67) and the landscape (No. 66), in the National Gallery, London, the Rainbow Landscape in the Wallace Collection (No. 62), the large landscape at Brussels (No. 391), and many other pictures, chiefly landscapes, now in European galleries under the name of Rubens. The true Rubens landscape, as pointed out elsewhere, is to be seen in the Vienna Gallery (No. 869). But compare this Kermesse picture here in the Louvre with the Flight of Lot (No. 2075) both as regards the figures and the landscape. Are they both by the same hand? The Kermesse is supposed to be ten years later than the Flight of Lot, and Rubens's handling doubtless changed and loosened somewhat during that time, but it did not fail or grow careless or blunder at any time in his career.

2118. ——— *Landscape*. The figures and sheep are certainly not by Rubens, and it may be inferred from the sky and the distance that his brush has not touched either of them. This is the same hand that did the large Kermesse picture (No. 2115), only now grown very careless, blackish in shadows, and spotty in lights. It is some follower of Rubens with mannerisms of his own. He is seen again at the National Gallery, London (No. 157).

2085 } ——— *The Médicis Series*. This series of pictures
2109 } represents, allegorically and otherwise, the life of Marie de Médicis or at least the chief features of it. The pictures were painted by Rubens and his pupils, during a period of four years (1622–1625), for the Palace of the Luxembourg. When they hung in the long, narrow gallery of the Louvre,

where they could not be seen adequately, it was quite the fashion to abuse them and speak of them as "those big, bad Rubenses, painted by his pupils." A few years ago the pictures were given their present setting, and immediately there was a change of opinion about them. Placed in a room where their united decorative splendour could be seen, their gorgeous quality instantly became apparent. The idea that the pictures were done wholly by his pupils never was quite correct and never had too much foundation in fact. Rubens's sketches for these pictures are now in the Munich Gallery and at the Hermitage, St. Petersburg. Some of the finished pictures speak for his hand and brush, helped out, in portions, by pupils, as was the case with Raphael and other painters. These pictures show the middle-period style and method of Rubens to great advantage. The prevailing colour notes of the series are red and gold, relieved by greens, greys, and blues. The light is wide-spread and with no pronounced shadow masses except in the Coronation picture and a night scene. The whole series is somewhat restored.

2085. — *The Destiny of Marie de Médicis*. This picture
 * shows in the Fates three commanding figures of great grace and beauty. Notice how the figures, placed on a narrow, upright canvas, are woven together in the lines—the Jupiter above being supplemented diagonally by the large Fate at his feet and the other two Fates repeating this diagonal line. The colour is very effective, especially in the robes of Jupiter at the top. How wonderful the drawing in all the figures!
2088. — *Henry IV Receiving the Portrait of Marie de*
 * *Médicis*. With fine types of Jupiter and Juno up

above, and Juno's peacocks for colour-splendour. An excellent portrait of the King standing lost in admiration before the portrait. The composition is a diagonal from Jupiter and Juno down to the King and his attendant. Notice the graceful angel holding the frame, the lovely cupids below with the helmet and shield, and the outstretched landscape at the back. Somewhat cleaned and repainted, it still remains one of the fine pictures of the series. What beautiful colour! What armour! What golden robes!

2090. ——— ***Landing of Marie de Médicis at Marseilles.***

This picture is a scheme of colour rather than an effectively drawn and planned composition. The fine nude figures in the water rather detract from Marie de Médicis above and the ethereal Victory over her head. There is some glitter of silks and brocades, but perhaps the best part of the picture is the back of the naiad at the extreme right. These naiads form one section of the picture which stops with the red cloth of the landing plank. The figures of the Queen and her attendants form the second section, and the angel, canopy, and architecture the third section. But they are not well held together—not even by colour.

2092. ——— ***Birth of Louis XIII at Fontainebleau.*** This is

*

a superb composition, with the Queen in the centre surrounded by deities and attendants—a grandly beautiful figure in her silken garments. Even the tender look of the mother and her tired lean-back in her chair are well done for a decorative composition, and there are realistic touches here and there—in the dress, the hands, the feet—that are effective. What splendid types surround her! No-

tice the Victory, with the beautifully painted hair, holding the red curtain at the top; the nymph with the golden dress at the left; the masculine figure holding the child. What silks and stuffs and glittering textures! There is a diagonal line indicated in the red cloth and repeated in the Apollo of the sky that gives snap and life to the group.

2094. — *Coronation of Marie de Médicis*. A gorgeous processional piece that David liked so much that he followed it in his *Coronation of the Empress Josephine*, to be seen in another room in the Louvre. Those who are downcast by the grossness and coarseness of the Rubens type should here study the heads of the Princess of Conti, the Duchess of Montpensier, and the attendant next her holding the Queen's train. What wonderful heads! What splendid types! How the heads fit on the necks and are in the centre of their ruffs! Look at the row of women's heads—all portraits, no doubt—at the left. They have the same wonderful setting of the heads and necks, with ruffs that travel around and back of the necks. The red robes are a little disturbing, perhaps, as compared with the garments of the gorgeous individual in the centre with his back to us. The goddesses of prosperity in the air are perhaps a little overdone, and the King in his box in the background is perhaps underdone. None of the background is above criticism, but some of the figures in the foreground are the best in the whole series.
2097. — *The Progress of Marie de Médicis to Pont-de-Cé*. The colour scheme of this picture seems a little cool for the rest of the series. The Queen, radiant and triumphant, is riding her horse with

much dignity, the blue of her nodding plumes being repeated in the flying figure and in the sky. The picture apparently shows much school work—in the figure behind the horse, in the figures of the sky, and in the landscape. The colour, though fine in itself, is hardly in keeping with that of the other pictures of the series.

2099. — *The Prosperity of the Regency.* With fine figures of nymphs in gorgeous garments at the right, but the canvas as a whole is too crowded with figures and too up-and-down in its lines. The picture was done in Paris by Rubens himself, and much of it done with the Queen looking on as he worked. Perhaps this embarrassed him, for the work is not so satisfactory as some of the others, though it contains beautiful morsels, such as the nymphs, the charming cupids, the satyrs, and the helmeted figure at the left. The Queen is gorgeously gowned, too, but Rubens probably prettified her under pressure. Look closely at the handling. It is Rubens's own brush, and should be taken as a criterion of Rubens's handling and applied to his other pictures in this room and elsewhere. Look at the handling of the satyrs at the right or the central figures, the flowers, the cupids. There is here no question of bad drawing, or spotty high lights, or ineffective brush-work which shows in so many alleged Rubenses. Every stroke is just right, quite perfect, absolute in its effect.

2101. — *The Queen Leaving the Castle of Blois.* A good portrait of the Queen, no doubt. The night scene, with the followers of the Queen about her, is well given, but the picture is a little out of key

with the others of the series. It is too dark. Rubens has again used a diagonal grouping here to give life and movement. The Queen is in the centre of the diagonal line, while the figures with the torches help out the top. It is not the most effective of the pictures in the series, though Rubens's own hand is apparent in the work here and there.

2103. — *Peace Concluded.* The central figure with the torch turned down is quite good, as also the Queen and the attendant back of her. Rubens has again used his diagonal arrangement of figures here to give movement and push upward. The best group of figures is at the left. Those at the right, including the figure with the snake, are a bit heavy. The architecture is not particularly well drawn and the sky is rather dark. They probably indicate school work.
2104. — *Interview between the Queen and Her Son.* The Queen as the centre of the picture is magnificent in white silk, as is Louis in his salmon-coloured scarf. All of the upper half of the picture is gorgeous in colour. At top and bottom darks are used to centralise the light on the two chief characters. These chief characters were done by Rubens's own hand; those at the right and left, with the animals below, were probably by pupils.
2102. — *The Queen Reconciled to Her Son.* It is less spirited than the earlier pictures of the series, as though the hand and brain of the designer of the series had become a little weary of harping on the same note. The nude Mercury (a rather fine figure) and the cardinals in red make up the colour scheme. The work is almost entirely by pupils. Compare the hair of the Queen and her attendant

with that in No. 2099, and you will see the difference there as elsewhere.

2100. — *The Majority of Louis XIII.* As decoration, it is not without fine colour quality and fine drawing, though it is largely the work of pupils. Here once more is the diagonal line showing in the rowers. The picture has movement but it is a little flat in the types.
2098. — *The Exchange of the Two Princesses.* This is quite a rainbow of colour. Every note of the palette is used, and without much breaking into half-tints. What splendid creatures the figures in helmets! And the two princesses in their wonderful silks, how beautifully they are done! These are portraits of Anne of Austria and Elizabeth of France. They were probably painted by Rubens's own hand, for it is not thinkable that he would trust them to a pupil. Their dresses are magnificent in sheen and texture. The rest of the picture was no doubt executed by pupils. The central figures are surrounded by other figures and framed in by the arching curtain above and the flat floor of the red dais below.
2095. — *Apotheosis of Henry IV.* In trying to give several incidents on the one canvas the painter has somewhat scattered this composition. The winged figure in the centre was relied upon to hold the various parts together, but it hardly does so. What a figure it is, with its wondrous breast and torso worthy of Michelangelo! Notice also the reclining figure at the left. These two figures are the strong features of the picture, though the kneeling figures at the right are splendid in their robes. The action of the picture begins at the left with

the King and swings up and to the right in a half arch. This is repeated in the winged figure, the armour, and the figure in green. There is once more a partial repetition of this springing arch in the courtier in black and in the Queen. We feel as though all these wheeling lines to the right should be met and counterbalanced by something from the right springing to the left. Perhaps that is why the composition is not entirely satisfactory. The picture has much pupils' work in it.

2093. — *Henry IV Commits the Government to Marie de Médicis.* Where in the many pictures of the Louvre can you find such a red as that in the small-clothes of the Dauphin? And where such texture painting as in the silk of the Queen's dress, or the golden robe of the attendant at the right, or the armour of the warriors at the left? Mere decorative effects? Yes; but that was what Rubens was striving for. The head of the attendant at the extreme right is that of Suzanne Fourment, the model for the Chapeau de Poil (No. 852) in the National Gallery, London. Again there is indication of pupils' work almost everywhere in this picture.

2091. — *The Marriage of Marie de Médicis and Henry IV.* The King as Jupiter and the Queen as Juno are seated in the clouds, with the suggestion again of the diagonal line repeated slightly in the car. What wonderful drawing and what colour splendour is here! No matter whether done by Rubens or by his pupils, the work is excellent. Notice the cupids riding the lions. They are very close to Rubens's own workmanship, as also the figures above. The car shows shop work, and also the little cupids at the top. Both King and Queen are superbly done.

2089. ——— *Marriage by Proxy of Marie de Médicis and Henry IV.* It is a more formal, balanced composition than the others of the series, though with quite as much richness and splendour of effect. The two chief figures show Rubens in part, but the rest of the picture seems the work of pupils. The Queen is truly queen-like.
2105. ——— *Triumph of Truth.* An upright composition designed to supplement No. 2085. The figures below are beautifully drawn, but the composition is not so happy as its companion piece on the opposite side of the main entrance. The arrangement is in the form of an inverted pyramid, or triangle, the nude figure being the acute angle. This nude was evidently touched in the head and hair by Rubens—no more.
2096. ——— *The Government of the Queen.* A huge, oblong canvas in the anteroom without. It is not effectively held together or centralised in interest by line, light, or colour. The eyes wander and find beautiful parts to admire, as, for instances, the gorgeous robe of the seated Jupiter, the backs of the figures to the left of his staff, the divine Apollo with the bow (taken from the Apollo Belvidere), the lovely Venus above him holding back the fiery Mars. There are parts of it of great beauty, but it is not a happy composition. Rubens evidently intended the composition to be that of an open V, the bottom of the V being the Apollo, the right arm of it springing up and away from the Venus, the left arm of it toward the Jupiter. But this very arrangement resulted in the scattering of the figures rather than in the uniting of them. The spaces under the arms of the V had to be filled in with

unrelated figures, as we see, and the angle of the V had again to be filled in with another group. It was a try at a new design, but not a very successful one. The original sketch for this picture in the Munich Gallery shows a large door cut through at the left where are now shown dark clouds, and this awkward necessity was probably responsible for the oddity of the composition.

2086. — *Birth of Marie de Médicis*. It does not speak so much for Rubens as for assistants in his workshop. It is not hung in the main room but in the anteroom without. Once more there is the use of diagonal composition to give life and motion. The colour is not remarkable.
2087. — *The Education of Marie de Médicis*. The flesh of the three Graces seems pallid for Rubens, but there is a large flow and swing of the figures and some charm in the little Marie de Médicis. The picture has been much restored, and the catalogue tells us that some of the drapery of the Graces was added by later hands. It must be regarded as studio work hurt by restoration. The nymph at the left has the face of Suzanne Fourment.
2560. *Ruisdael, Jacob van. The Sunburst*. At last
* we have here a Ruisdael of really fine quality, with heaped cumulus clouds, a blue sky, and a commanding stretch of mountain landscape. The colour is grey but harmonious and the atmospheric effect is excellent. The mountains are well drawn and the whole picture is realistic—that is, for Ruisdael. See also the small landscape, No. 2561.
2558. — *Storm on the Dikes of Holland*. A fine ma-
* rine with a good deal of power in the water of the

foreground and the feeling of a great wind. There is a breath of reality about it, and the pity is that Ruisdael did not oftener do this sort of thing, which was before him, rather than his mountain waterfalls which he saw only in his imagination.

2559. — *The Thicket or Rush.* This is the picture that was so much studied at one time by Rousseau, Dupré, and others of the Fontainebleau-Barbizon School. These men got their first impetus and influence from the pictures of the Dutch painters, and not from Constable, as is persistently asserted by historians of art who will not take the trouble to compare dates of birth. This is an attempt at realistic portrayal, and with considerable success. It is a good Ruisdael.
- 2661D. **Ruysdael, Salomon van.** *Landscape.* A large and mannered work in the style of Van Goyen, whom Ruysdael followed. Notice the trees and the muddy foliage, with the ill-drawn reflections in the water. Everything in the picture is done with the same coarse, heavy brush. See also Nos. 2561B and 2561C.
2564. **Santvoort, Dirck Dircksz van.** *Pilgrims at Emmaus.* It suffers by comparison with the Rembrandt (No. 2539) of the same subject in this gallery, but in itself it is not a bad picture though a little too sleek and smooth in the surface. The heads are overwrought. The old man is somewhat in the vein of the attributed Rembrandt (No. 2541A) across the room.
1515. **Sarto, Andrea del.** *Holy Family.* Rather too smoothly done, but with robes quite as well drawn as Fra Bartolommeo's and flesh colour far better.

An oval composition filling a square, with repeated lines of much grace and force. What arms and legs Andrea could draw! And what shadows he could paint! The colour is a little rambling and wanting in unity, while the surface has suffered from much scrubbing and repainting. The Child's knee, St. John's legs, and all the hands and arms have lost their finer modelling.

1514. ———*Charity*. A monumental figure after the style of Michelangelo's Madonnas in stone, and with the same closely-knit pyramidal group. Fine in the drawing but somewhat lacking in that austere majesty which doubtless Andrea thought to convey. The landscape is excellent and quite mature for a Florentine to have done! The colour is unfortunate in its predominant blues with hardly enough warm tones to balance them. Well placed on the canvas, and a considerable work of art that perhaps fails to impress as it should. The surface has suffered greatly, and the whole face of it is stained with bad varnishes and repaintings.
1516. ———*Holy Family*. It is too badly repaired and mended to say much about it except that the colour, the light and shade, with the oval of the composition, are still attractive. Perhaps the figures are crowded into the oval mechanically and with some effort. It is almost impossible to say now who did the work.
- 1516A. ———*Portrait of Andrea Fausti*. It seems to be tolerably well drawn in the hands and face—barring the cleaning-room scrubbing—but is it the drawing of Andrea the Faultless or of some lesser Florentine? Did Andrea do the hard eyelids, or the wandering outline of the face, or the poor ear

and the problematical neck and cheek? The cloak is more like him, but the hands are a little square in the joints and flat in the modelling. Again, the grey colour suggests Andrea, but perhaps the suggestion is superficial. Franciabigio did things in the same scheme of grey. Not a bad portrait nor yet a very good one. It is a little overposed.

1519. **Savoldo, Girolamo.** *Portrait of a Man.* It looks as though carved out of wood and painted an Indian red, but, even so, it has some strength to it. The very harshness of the face lines give it force, and the well-drawn eyes lend it intelligence. The dress is rather well done. Is it a Savoldo?

N. N. **Scorel, Jan van.** *Portrait of Paracelsus.* It looks like a version of the Rubens at Brussels (No. 388), which is said to be a copy after a picture at Nancy.

1665. **Sienese School.** *Calvary.* One of several early panels of the Sienese School grouped together, including Nos. 1667, 1664, 1666. They are all attractive in colour and in the tooling and stamping of the gold haloes. The panels are very decorative though now somewhat injured.

1525. **Signorelli, Luca.** *Birth of the Virgin.* It has
* great spirit with astonishing colour. The light and atmosphere of the room, the set-in of the figures, with the movement from right to left, how wonderful they are for that Early Renaissance time! And for Signorelli, who was so much more of a draughtsman than a painter! It is a fine early work of the master and a masterpiece of drawing, light, shadow, colour.

1527. — *Fragment of a Large Composition.* A group of figures cut away from a large composition. It

is spiritless, lifeless, though bright in colour. It has not Signorelli's drawing in attractive presentation, but is a dull statement of a dull group of facts. Notice No. 1525 for a sharp contrast to it.

1526. ——— *Adoration of Magi*. A dark picture with a huddle of people in the foreground and middle distance. The landscape, on the other hand, shows feeling for space though shut in at the sides. There is crude drawing in the robes and figures, some rather sentimental types, as, for example, the standing figure at the left, and quite a display of dark, shadowed, hot colour. The total effect does not excite enthusiasm. Many features of it suggest that it may be workshop work. It is rather savage drawing for even Signorelli to have done.

N. N. ——— *St. Jerome*. It is probably by Signorelli, but it is not such a supreme piece of drawing as one might imagine at first blush. It is hard in modelling but has some brutal strength about it. Some of his school cultivated just this same brutality with rather poor results. A good landscape at the back and a rather lumpy, heavy figure on the cross in the sky.

1383. **Simone Martini**. *The Way to Calvary*. A small panel of dramatic power in the composition, and with clear colour. Notice the Magdalen in red. The picture has feeling as well as delicacy of workmanship. Companion portions in Berlin (No. 1070A, with a different background in the sky) and in Antwerp (Nos. 257-260).

1531. **Solario, Andrea**. *Portrait of Charles d'Amboise*.
* A beautiful portrait in its colour and in its landscape background. As characterisation it is per-

haps a little placid and smooth, but noble and dignified. The drawing is much in the style of the Lucrezia Crivelli (No. 1600), with which it should be closely compared. Both pictures have been attributed to Leonardo, and there are good grounds for believing them done by the same hand; but it is questionable if that hand was either Leonardo's or Solario's. Certainly the pictures bear a family resemblance to each other in look, sentiment, quality, drawing, and flesh colour. They are nearer together than were Leonardo and Solario. Notice the trees at the right and the fine snow mountains at the back. Did Solario ever reach up to their maturity of conception or handling? He approached it (at the Brera, Milan), but fell short. Notice how different from this are the Solario landscapes in Nos. 1532 and 4530. Leonardo, on the contrary, suggests these trees in his St. Anne picture here in the Louvre. See also the note on the Lucrezia Crivelli (No. 1600), under Leonardo. The painter of this picture and the Lucrezia Crivelli did also the portrait, No. 433, in the Castello Museum, Milan.

1532. — *Calvary*. An arrangement of brilliant colours in a landscape, very different from that in No. 1531. The drawing of the Christ is rather bad, and the figures below are not much better. The panel is spattered with colours, but there is little sense of colour manifested. The landscape is the best part of a rather loosely arranged picture. Hurt by retouching.

1530. — *Madonna of the Green Cushion*. In Solario's early style. A pretty, oval arrangement of the figures within a square, rather porcelain-like in

surface, hard in drawing, and a little sharp in colour. There is some naïve play of the Child with his foot and some tenderness in the Mother. The landscape shows Venetian influence and is crude and immature as compared with that in No. 1531. Yet this landscape in No. 1530 is the true Solario landscape.

1539. **Spagna, Lo. *The Nativity*.** It contains the true
 * Umbrian sentiment with the types, colour, and landscape of the Umbrian School. In feeling it is rather fine. The angels above and below, the Madonna, Joseph, and the shepherds all belong to the same family and are imbued with the same emotion and tenderness. The picture is good in colour and in feeling for space, though frail in its drawing. A replica of it is in the Vatican Gallery.
1540. ——— ***Madonna and Child*.** A slight Madonna and
 * Child that show some very positive indications of being by Lo Spagna. The influence upon Lo Spagna of Pinturicchio is here apparent. There is another version hanging on a door-casing near at hand, and put down to the School of Perugino.
2579. **Steen, Jan. *A Family Meal*.** A huddled composition and not by any means Steen at his best. The drawing and brush-work are both careless. For an excellent example of Steen, see his *Bad Company* (No. 2580) in this gallery.
2580. ——— ***Bad Company*.** A very beautiful Steen—Steen,
 * who always seemed at his best pictorially when his characters were at their worst morally. This is a painter's picture from start to finish, with perfect drawing and superb handling. Notice the arm

and dress of the young woman picking the young man's pocket, the head of the old go-between, the shoulders of the creature in blue who is so tipsy she cannot see straight. As for the young man, how heavily he leans and lurches, what a wonderful coat he wears, how his shoes and stockings are painted! And the ruffians at the back, how well they keep their place in the picture! It is superb painter's work—much better than the large No. 2578 hanging near it.

2157. **Teniers the Younger, David.** *Works of Mercy.*

* A large and beautifully painted picture. The landscape and the sky are excellent and the colour is rich and harmonious. What still-life, what heads and figures, what a sky and clouds! Reminiscent of the elder Teniers.

2162. ——— *Interior of an Inn.* This picture, with Nos. 2156, 2158, 2166, are good examples of Teniers's facile handling and good colour. There are a great many of his pictures here in the Louvre, and some of them are excellent.

2591. **Terborch, Gerard.** *The Reading Lesson.* It has not the precise Terborch quality about it. The painting of the child's hair and the woman's face, the brown coat and fur edging are not what one expects from this painter, though the general look of the picture gives a reason for thinking he painted it. Compare it, however, with No. 2587 and see how inferior it is to that fine work. But considered by itself it is a fair work in both colour and breadth of treatment.

2589. ——— *The Concert.* An inferior Terborch, which has had the additional misfortune to be much cleaned

and somewhat repainted, as notice the face and hands of the figure with the lute. It comes perilously near to being a picture by Verkolie.

2588. — *The Music Lesson*. Perhaps at one time it was a masterpiece, but to-day it is much hurt by excessive cleaning, as, for instance, in the face, leg, and wrist of the player and in the face, arms, and dress of the lady. All of which may account for the pallid look of it. There are still fine things in it, such as the drawing of the furniture, for instance.
2587. — *The Military Gallant*. A Terborch of much excellence in the figures, the table, the still-life, but now a little injured in the red background by old repainting that has covered everything up to the mantel. Notice the good drawing of the hands and the painting of the hair, the fur, the satin, the leather boots, and then go at once to Nos. 2589 and 2591 for purposes of comparison. What a good table-cloth in this picture! What a floor and what well-placed feet upon it!
1547. **Tiepolo, Giovanni Battista.** *The Lord's Supper*. A little warm in colouring, but very good in its types, and very fetching in its effective handling of the brush. Tiepolo's brush-work was facility itself.
1549. — *Madonna and Child with St. John*. A banner painted on both sides (St. Martin saying Mass on the reverse), coarsely done, and with little of the handling of Tiepolo now recognisable in it. It was never more than a rough painting, done probably for street decoration or processional purposes.
1464. **Tintoretto, Jacopo (Robusti).** *Susanna at the Bath*. It is not a satisfactory Tintoretto, inas-

much as it shows little of his invention or imaginative quality and still less of his grace, or power, or impetuosity. The Susanna is true enough in bulk, but lumpy, the Elders are only spots of colour, and the foolish-looking maid at the left again figures only as colour. The picture is not inspired—not even in the tropical foliage. The figure of Susanna has been flayed and the whole picture restored. Look at the now dreadful ducks in the pool for an idea of how much the picture has blackened.

1465. ———*Paradise*. A first sketch for the enormous picture in the Ducal Palace, Venice. It is different from the finished picture in many features of composition and grouping, is brighter in light, higher keyed in colour, and has not nearly so many figures.
- 1464 bis. ———*Christ Mourned by Angels*. No matter who did it, it is well done. It is only a sketch, but what feeling it has! What colour and light and shadows it suggests!
1467. ———*Portrait of a Man*. It might originally have passed as a portrait of Aretino by Titian, but now no one knows what it is. The picture is a wreck, as may be seen by looking at the face and hands. It should be in the storeroom.
1583. * **Titian (Tiziano Vecellio).** *The Crowning with Thorns*. A comparatively late picture, done perhaps when Titian was in his seventies. There is something of strain about the action of the figures, something of the theatrical about their staging, something academic and posed rather than real or actual. But there is reality enough about

certain details of it, as, for instance, the physical agony of Christ, the drawing of the legs, knees, and feet. Look at them for a moment, for they are supreme. Realistic also are the chain armour of the man at the right, the steps, the wall. The picture is now yellowed by varnish and darkened in the shadows, but there is still some good colour and a feeling of air about it. The theme was repeated later in a broader manner in the Munich picture (No. 1114).

1584. — *The Entombment*. A famous picture and, all told, quite a perfect one. It is an arch composition, on an oblong canvas, with the figures well balanced and beautifully knit together. The weird light is centralised on the dead Christ and the white sheet. The figure of Christ is not rigid, but relaxed, sagging down heavily. This sagging curve of the figure is emphasised by repetition in the curved backs of the supporting figures. You feel the strain of the men holding the body—the strain of weight. Beautifully drawn is the collapsed figure. Look at the knees and feet, the arms and hands, for their drawing—particularly that limp left arm and hand. The shadow on the face has blackened through time and is now a little false in value, but Titian intended that it should obscure the face or, at least, make it mysterious. The grief of St. John at the back, the Madonna and Magdalen at the left, is intense, but it is a noble, restrained grief. It is the human element in a sacred scene—an inarticulate cry in a gorgeous colour pattern. The colour of the picture is superb in its fulness, richness, and resonance. Every one praises its harmony. In the fine sky at the back, lighted by a rising moon, notice how the painter

has repeated the blue of the Madonna's robe. The white of the sheet is again repeated in the sleeve and fainter and farther away in the whitish clouds. The man with the beard looks like Titian's friend Aretino. Painted about 1525. Pieced out in the sky and a little retouched, but in fair condition.

1592. — *The Man with the Glove.* A famous portrait of Titian's, much talked about by young art students in Paris, and generally considered by them as the last word in portraiture. Beyond doubt, it is a fine portrait, with much nobility and dignity of presence and, withal, much simplicity and large truth. The man is apparently without fear and without reproach. The glove is easily and effectively done; the right hand is perhaps a little posed, a little academic. The picture is now rather black, and, unhappily, it has been hurt by restorations. Notice that the shadow on the neck is too dark, as the result of repainting. Elsewhere throughout the picture there have been retouching and repainting—in the face, hands, glove, and in the blacks and whites of the costume. The contours of the head have almost disappeared in the dark background.

1586. — *The Council of Trent.* This picture is not by Titian, but it is a good picture nevertheless. The light and atmosphere of the Church, its spaciousness and lift, are well suggested. How well the figures are massed and keep their place! And what good colour! The colour points to Titian's School, from which the picture doubtless emanated.

1595. — *Portrait of a Man.* It will not do for Titian, though attributed to him in the catalogue. Moroni

might be a nearer guess, but there is no certainty about that either. It is an ordinary portrait, and the best part of it is in the hands. The head is neither pleasing nor convincing.

1588. — *Portrait of Francis I.* The catalogue suggests that this portrait was not painted from life. It was, perhaps, executed from a medal, as the sharp profile indicates. Perhaps that is why the figure looks as though it were guessed at, with its broad, flat front and poor arms. The drawing of the neck under the ear is rather bad. No doubt Titian did it, but did it carelessly.

1590. — *Alphonso I and Laura Dianti.* One of the series of Titian's beauty pictures, in which the same model appears, whether Laura Dianti or the Duchess of Urbino, or merely a studio model—the last the most likely solution. A lovely picture, or at least it must have been that before it was repainted and had darkened. All the face, bust, arms, and hands have been gone over, but it still has some charm about it, as though, like a battered Greek marble, its beauty could not be wholly destroyed. Look at the lovely contours of the cheeks and chin, the roundness of the shoulder, the beauty of the arm. What form is there still! And what beautiful passages of colour!

1589. — *An Allegory in Honour of Alphonse d'Avalos.* The figures of the two women at right and left are variations of those used by Titian in the Venus Equipping Cupid of the Borghese Gallery at Rome. The man at the back is, or was supposed to be, a portrait of Alphonse d'Avalos. The picture is still a rich piece of old Cordova-leather colouring, but the drawing and painting as well as the sur-

face were hopelessly wrecked by repainting years ago. It is now yellow with varnish. But notice the grace of the composition—the filling of the space with a large oval formed by the heads, necks, and arms. What a graceful swing of line in the figure at the left! This is again a variation of the composition of the *Venus Equipping Cupid*.

1577. —*Madonna and Child with Saints*. An early Titian, and perhaps never a very good one. It is now in poor condition from staining, repainting, and bad restoration, as notice in the sky, in the figure in red, in the faces and hands of both Madonna and Child. Still a bright bit of colour, but wanting in depth and quality. Another version is in the Vienna Gallery (No. 166).
1578. —*Madonna of the Rabbit*. A smaller and therefore a less-injured picture than some other Titians in the gallery. It has suffered little. A comparatively early work of Titian's, lofty in the types and very fine in its colour. The Madonna, Child, and St. Catherine make a charming group, with delicate flesh notes surrounded by whites, blues, and reds. The whites are repeated in the rabbit, the blues in the hills, the red in the sky, the green scarf of St. Catherine in the grass of the middle distance. What lovely shadows on the Child and on the face of St. Catherine! In a landscape of much breadth and sweep. The motive is one that Titian partly repeated in the picture in the National Gallery at London (No. 635).
1579. —*Holy Family*. Little more than the original design is now apparent. Notice the bad condition of the hands of the Madonna. The faces are just as badly injured. There is still some sweep to

the landscape, some colour charm, and enough nobility and loftiness in the types to make one angry over their mistreatment. The St. Agnes is the same model as in the Palma Vecchio at the Venice Academy (No. 147). It is probably a school piece.

1580. ———*Holy Family*. The group of figures is done with some constraint, some weakness of drawing, especially noticeable in the Joseph. The trees are prim and niggled in the foliage, as a copyist might do them, and the sky is uncertainly smooth and not drawn, but put in flatly in strips of paint. It is probably a copy by some pupil or at best a school work.

1581. ———*Pilgrims at Emmaus*. Still a fine picture, and even now the figures, set back and in, are surrounded by atmosphere, enveloped in the shadows of the hall. Probably Titian amended it and changed it several times before he let it go from him. A half painted-out column still shows in the sky at the right and something has been changed back of the head of the Christ. The Christ and the apostle at the right are large and dignified types and the boy was once fine in colour, no doubt. The surface has been cleaned too much. Yet how these injured pictures survive and shine in spots of beauty! Look at the table—how it is drawn! at the white of the cloth—what a surface! at the still-life of wine-glasses, bottle, and bread—how they are painted! Could the Little Dutchmen, painting lemon skins and wine-glasses, reach up to this? And look at the figures of the group in that big landscape, with the distant Alps at sunset. It is a maimed masterpiece but still a great picture.

1585. ———*St. Jerome.* A night effect, with moonlight behind the trees, but the light is not very apparent in the foreground. St. Jerome shines largely by studio light. A blackened picture, but with a fine landscape, and still possessed of the charm of mystery in the shadows of the night, the dark trees, the high rocks, and the suggestion of the sea in the distance.
1587. ———*Jupiter and Antiope.* It was injured a long time ago by fire and bad restoration and afterward repainted by Coypel. Since Coypel's time it has been relined and cleaned some more. Among the manglers of the carcass, possibly some one painted in the central tree and thus cut the composition into two pieces. Originally, no doubt, it was a fine landscape. And originally the figure of Antiope bore, perhaps, some resemblance to the Dresden Giorgione. It has even yet some grace of form. The picture was known formerly as the Venus del Prado, and may have been done by Schiavone. See Schiavone's Jupiter and Io at St. Petersburg (No. 121) for similar work.
1591. ———*Portrait of a Man.* A noble portrait in the style of the Man with the Glove (No. 1592) and probably done at the same period. It is more reserved and less startling than the Man with the Glove, but is not the less a fine piece of characterisation. Slightly repainted in the forehead, nose, and eyes. Perhaps that accounts for the harsh drawing and the red colouring of the eyelids. The background has become very dark. Of a kind and quality to match the portrait by Titian at Munich (No. 1111)—as fine a portrait as Titian ever produced.
- **

1556. **Tura, Cosimo. *Pietà*.** A lunette, or arch composition, in which the lines of the figures follow the lines of the arch. The drawing is in Tura's usual harsh manner, with stringy, contorted figures, twisted joints, and mannered drapery. The colour is morbid but extremely decorative and very rich, as in the purples and greens and reds. The sentiment is tragic and the expression of the faces morose. The grey, dead figure is the centre of light and interest, and to it the other figures are subordinated. Tura is always a forceful master, though not possessed of charm or grace in recitation. At times, however, he is as classic, as Greek, as Mantegna. As a draughtsman in line for line's sake, there is something singularly fine about him.
1557. — ***A Monk Standing*.** An excellent picture for the study of Tura's drawing. The lines and the light and shade of the grey robe are very beautiful. The head, hands, and feet have the same fine quality. On a panel which is broken below.
1273. **Uccello, Paolo. *Battle of San Romano*.** This is a large picture, and very important in art history, but it is now so blackened and discoloured that it is difficult to make much out of it. There are three pictures in this series by Paolo, the one in the National Gallery, London, being superior to this example and to the one in the Uffizi. Odd as these men and horses appear, and archaic and wooden as they undoubtedly are, the painter had the true spirit of art in his work. The horses and men are for painting what the Colleoni and Gattematata are in bronze though perhaps not so well set forth. Donatello, Verrocchio, and Paolo Uccello were of the same brotherhood in art though not of the

same power artistically. The composition is processional. The figures and horses at the right with the upright spears indicate repose—the troops that have not yet come into action. The movement is to the left, and becomes more violent as the spears descend from the upright to the horizontal. Look at this cumulative action, too, in the legs under the horse's belly at the left. The arrangement is not so well given here as in the London picture. The movement is not so good. Nor is the colour so fine, though there is some display of reds, blues, browns, whites, blacks with golds. The prance of the black horse, the riders in steel, the background are now rather lost and confused. As it now appears, the painting is a flat piece of decoration and, as such, has quality and distinction. See the note on the National Gallery picture (No. 583) as, in a measure, explanatory of this.

1731. **Velasquez, Diego de Silva y. *Portrait of the Infanta Margarita.*** This is the only unquestioned portrait by Velasquez in the Louvre. There is no doubt about its being by Velasquez and in his very best manner. It is, in both style and spirit, of a piece with the bust portrait of Philip IV in the National Gallery, London (No. 745), and the three children's portraits at Vienna (Nos. 621, 611, and 615). It is broadly painted and yet done with the utmost tenderness, with a delight in the subject, and a painter's joy in the successful handling of materials. For proof, look at the lovely quality of the child's hair and the light upon it, the drawing of the childish cheek and chin, the placing of those lustreless but expressive eyes, the doing of the shadow about the neck and ears. Notice again the handling of the chains, the dress, the bows, the black borders.

**

They look roughly and carelessly done; but back away from the picture and see how quickly they begin to take exact and positive form, how the eyes grow more expressive, the nose becomes modelled, the light on the hair turns into sheen and texture, the chair grows into an actual chair, revealing not only its colour but its velvet-cover quality. Notice, further, the child's body under the stiff court dress—how well rounded it is. And notice the air that surrounds the little figure. Can you not feel the atmospheric envelope? And the charming colour that makes the whole picture so supremely decorative? When you have wearied of looking at the picture in its details, stand back and look at it as a whole, and consider what an admirable characterisation of a royal child you have before you. It is a masterpiece in every respect. And a wonder—the wonder that belongs to all phases of great genius. See the note on the Velasquez Philip IV in the National Gallery, London (No. 745). The gold lettering at top (in French) was probably added later. Pieced out at the bottom; the finger ends of the right hand added.

1735. ——— *Portrait of Queen Mariana of Austria.* (La Caze Coll.) A consideration of this picture must be referred back, at the start, to the Infanta Margarita portrait (No. 1731) as the standard of Velasquez here in the Louvre. The Infanta portrait is Velasquez at his height. Study that picture in connection with the note upon it, and then come back at once to this picture. There is a difference between them that is not exactly the difference between Velasquez at his best and Velasquez in a tamer mood. The beautiful hair of the first portrait is here replaced by a wig, but, even so,

when studied for the light and shade upon it it will be found less effective, less subtle in the uniform shadows of it, less accurate in drawing and touch than in the first portrait. Look at the wig where it meets the cartonage-like forehead; or at the eyes, which are so infinitely inferior in drawing though bright in colour; at the cheeks, which have not the fleshy quality, and the shadows on the neck and chin, which have not the luminosity of the Infanta portrait. Come down to the neck, which is a little false in drawing and lighting; the dress, which is easily done but not with certainty in the bows and pearls and collar; the arms, which are awkwardly placed; the form, which is almost unbelievable; the envelope of air, which is lacking; the colour, which wants in quality. Did the same hand do both pictures with such different results? Possibly, but not probably. We must take into consideration that this picture has been partly repainted and the brush underneath falsified or nullified in places by the restorer's brush above it; but, even so, there is a fundamental difference apparent. The picture is very close to Velasquez, but perhaps not directly by him. It is probably a school version of the half-length of the same subject at Vienna (No. 617), blocked out and painted by a pupil, perhaps touched up by the master, and afterward spoiled by a restorer. Beruete does not agree with this, but thinks the picture a preliminary study for the Vienna one.

1736. ——— *Portrait of a Young Woman.* (La Caze Coll.) After a study of Nos. 1731 and 1735 this picture seems an impossibility as a Velasquez. There is not a stroke of Velasquez's brush in or about it.

You have merely to look at the plastered hair so badly lighted and painted at the sides, at the painting of the forehead, the ill-drawn eyes, nose, and mouth, the altogether impossible neck, the flat chest and body, the armless sleeves, the fumbling handling, the absence of colour, light, and air to feel sure that Velasquez never did it. It is a poor picture by Carreño or some one in or about his studio.

1732. — *Philip IV.* Look at the trees, sky, and hills at the right and you will get an idea of the picture's quality. It is an old copy (with some changes) of the picture at the Prado, Madrid (No. 1184)—the figure and dog much better done than the background.
1734. — *A Meeting of Thirteen Persons.* There is nothing of Velasquez about it. It is a later work of his school—the work of some pupil or follower. The same hand probably did the large Boar Hunt in the National Gallery, London.
2600. *Velde the Younger, Willem van de. Marine.* The sea piece that we usually expect from Van de Velde, but well done and attractive.
1673. *Venetian School. Portrait of a Woman.* No doubt it was put down to the Venetian School because of its brown skin, flat falling hair, and red dress. The face is hard in the brows and nose, the eyes are ill drawn, the chin is sharp, the neck and chest flat, the right hand excellent, the colour very good. It shows a mixture of Venetian and northern influences, and was probably done by Bartolommeo Veneto—as Mr. Berenson has affirmed—though there are features, such as the hands, the chain, the neck-yoke, that point to the Florentine School.

2456. **Vermeer (or Van der Meer) of Delft, Jan.** *The Lace Worker.* A small but very clever Vermeer, apparently in its original state so far as the surfaces are concerned. The subject is attractive and the colour is charming. The small white dots—a technical mannerism of the painter—appear in the collar and on the table-cloth. This is the true Vermeer, not the pseudo-Vermeer. See the notes upon him in The Hague Gallery.
- *
1192. **Veronese, Paolo Caliari.** *Marriage in Cana.* This picture is too large and too great as art to be adequately treated in a short note. The student is referred to an article by Kenyon Cox, in Scribner's Magazine, for December, 1904, in which this picture with its intricate composition is well analysed. Perhaps it will be sufficient to say here, in a general way, that the composition is a series of inset angles or squares, as indicated by the lines of the table. The abruptness of these lines is rendered less obvious by surrounding the table with figures. The figures on both sides of the table, seated and standing, serve also to repeat and emphasise the inset lines of the table itself. Notice, further, that back of the table and rising higher on the canvas comes the stone balustrade, again repeating the table inset and again manned by standing figures along it to break the straight line somewhat and to give it colour. Still further back you will see the inset square once more indicated in the columns of architecture which recede on either side, and at the back make a feint at crossing and enclosing the scene, like the stone balustrade, but stop with a suggestion, leaving the eye to roam off to the distant campanile and beyond that to the far clouds against the blue sky.
- ***

Looked at more casually, and less structurally, the picture is of a gathering of richly robed people in a Renaissance architectural setting of huge proportions under a blue sky, the depth of which is suggested by the pigeons flying in the air. In the middle foreground, as characters at the feast, appear Paolo himself (playing a viol), Titian (with a cello), Bassano (with a flute). In the left foreground are Francis I, Charles V, Eleanor of Austria, Mary of England, and many others. Wonderful types appear everywhere. They all wear splendid robes. What head-dresses, jewels, table ornaments, still-life! What columns, balconies, and distant towers! This is not a humble marriage in Cana, but a grand Venetian pageant-feast. The picture is splendidly spectacular, the height of Venetian painting, the climax of the Renaissance, the last and most brilliant phase of Italian decorative art. The many figures are well held together in light and air; the composition binds them again by lines and groups; the colour blends them into unison and harmony. Every note in the scale is divided and subdivided and yet all ring into one magnificent harmony. The hold-together of this enormous picture—the skill with which it is woven into a unity, a united impression—is the most wonderful part of it. It should be looked at and studied every time one enters the Louvre, for both technically and decoratively it is perhaps the most marvellous of all the paintings in this gallery.

1193. — *Feast in the House of Simon.* A few minutes' comparison of this supper piece with the large Marriage in Cana opposite should convince one that the figures are slighter and less majestic, the

costumes more formal and less magnificent, the architecture less fine in colour and less true in drawing, the sky less real, the light less luminous, the whole colour scheme less colourful and less harmonious. The columns are not detached from one another, the drawing of the figures is weak and often faulty, the values are not precisely true. All of which does not point to Paolo in a weaker or more commonplace mood of mind and hand so much as to some member of his school trying to do a huge supper picture after Paolo's formula and not succeeding very well. It is a school piece and has been repainted somewhat.

1190. — *Holy Family*. Small, but rather good in colour and composition. The Madonna has a far-away look in her eyes, the Child is graceful if ill drawn, and the attendant saint at the right is a fine patch of colour if nothing more. The donor is not so badly done as the St. George at the left. It is a sketchy little picture probably done by some member of Paolo's family. Injured in part.
1194. — *Christ Sinking Under the Cross*. The type, face, and red robe of Christ are well given, but for the rest of the picture there is little to be said in praise save that it shows rich colour. It is some sort of a workshop picture.
1195. — *Calvary*. A rich piece of colour with fine robes, tall types, and much grace of movement. How graceful the oval of figures about the Madonna or the Magdalen at the foot of the cross! The figures on the cross are not strengthened by their repeated lines (emphasised in the ladder and the crosses), but they are strong as colour against the lead-hued sky. The woman in a gold-coloured

robe with her face hidden is effective. It is a diagonal composition in which the groups cut across the wide sky and landscape. A similar picture in the Venice Academy is put down to Carletto Caliari. This Louvre picture is probably by the son rather than by the father. It is too slight for Paolo.

1197. — *St. Mark Crowning the Theological Virtues.* This decoration was painted for the ceiling of a hall in the Ducal Palace at Venice and not for the Gallery of the Louvre, where it is seen at the wrong angle and focus and is meaningless, almost ridiculous. It is a school piece. No. 1198, in the Salon Carré, is of the same quality and history.
1199. — *Portrait of a Young Woman.* Look at the drawing of the facial outline, the brows, the askew nose, the wooden arms, the pulpy fingers, the flat-headed child, and the crazy-looking dog. It may originally have been a Paolo, but it is now almost any one's picture.
1189. — *The Fainting of Esther.* Taken from a Venetian palace, shortened at the top, widened at the sides, and restored innumerable times, what chance is there now of this picture representing its original painter? The figures are noble and commanding, and the balanced composition with the architectural background are there; but that is about all. Probably a workshop picture.
1191. — *Holy Family.* A small picture with lofty types, handsome robes, and much warmth of colour, which seems to have been sufficient catalogue warrant for putting it down to Paolo Veronese. It is possibly a school study.

1196. ———*The Disciples at Emmaus*. A genuine enough Paolo, but so repaired and repainted that it is practically ruined. Even the blue sky has gone brown and the landscape has turned greenish-white. As for the figures, their drawing and modelling are now too distorted for any comment. You have merely to look at the hands and arms. Originally, no doubt, a fine picture. The two children in brocades, with the dog in the foreground, are said to be the painter's daughters. How lovely they are still!
1188. ———*Susanna and the Elders*. Look at the hard back and arm of Susanna, with the manner in which the head is set on the wooden neck and shoulders, and ask yourself if it is worth while to hold a great master responsible for such repainted and ruined work as this. The picture has been enlarged in height and width—a French and Italian gallery habit, suggesting that the old masters were too feeble-minded to know the right-sized canvases for their pictures. Probably school work.
1187. ———*Burning of Sodom*. With good action and some bad drawing in the flying figures. Also some sketchy painting and agreeable colour, in the style of Paolo Veronese, but with little to indicate directly that he was the painter of the picture.
2370. Victoor, Jan. *Isaac Blessing Jacob*. Large, and elaborately painted. The surface is smooth, the colour deep but factitious, the draperies prettified and weak. It pretends but does not fulfil. Notice the uneasy curtains and the prominence of them.
2371. ———*Portrait of a Young Girl*. Good in colour, but weak in sentiment and rather pretty in its painting.

2196. **Weyden, Roger van der.** *Deposition.* A tragic picture with much fine colour and some harsh lines. It is possibly an old copy or perhaps a Van der Weyden school piece. Though near him, it is hardly by Van der Weyden himself. Marked on the frame as a Bouts, which is nearer the mark than Van der Weyden.

N. N. ——— *Christ, Madonna, and St. John.* A recently
 * acquired triptych with Mary Magdalen and St. John Baptist in the wings. The central panel is wrought with great truth, feeling, and beauty. It is minutely done and yet for the time and the kind of work it is freely done. The drawing is excellent in every way, in every detail, and not more so in the figures than in the landscape. Notice the manner of doing the trees, the distant city, the white mountains, the sea, the rocks. The figures are a little flat and, of course, the landscape is only their background and not their envelope. How beautifully they are drawn in the sharp, insistent Flemish manner! What heads and hands! What feeling and right sentiment! What a wonderful halo about the head of Christ—wonderful in a decorative sense! The colour of the robes is deeper and darker here than in the wings.

The left wing is done in a manner similar to the central panel, and so too the right wing; but this right wing is perhaps by another hand than Roger's. It is not absolutely in tone with the other panels but is lighter in colour, higher in key. The head-dress, the white vase, the red sleeve are all a little "jumpy." Moreover, the trees, rocks, and landscape here are done with more repetition of type, more conventionality, more constraint. This is also true of the drawing of the figure, the hair, the

flesh. The difference is slight and the right panel is well done; in fact, only a shade different from the others. Perhaps it was done at a later time, but it is more likely that it is pupils' or assistants' work. The whole triptych is in good condition, a true enough Roger, and a valuable addition to the Louvre.

2638. **Wynants, Jan. *Landscape.*** A small picture, but charming in the spread of the trees against the sky, in the figures, in the light and air, in the colour.
2637. — ***Landscape.*** With a dull light and a dreary colour, neither of them possible even in cloudy weather, to say nothing of sunlight under a blue sky. But, of course, the studio formula required that the sun, the sky, and the whole landscape should be sacrificed to that spot of white on the cow in the foreground.
1740. **Zurbarán, Francisco de. *St. Apollonia.*** A small and rather crudely drawn figure that means more as life, as art, as decoration than the large squares of canvas (Nos. 1738 and 1739), by the same painter, which are shown near at hand. The costume and the colour scheme are unique.
- 1738 } — ***St. Peter Nolasque and St. Raymond.*** This
 1739 } canvas and the Burial of a Bishop (No. 1739) are companion pieces of pictures at Berlin and Dresden. There is good work about them in drawing and painting, and the robes are broadly and freely painted, but the pictures seem prosaic and dull. They stir no interest and rouse no one with a trumpet blast of colour.

INDEX OF PICTURES BY NUMBERS

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>126. Clouet, Jean.</p> <p>127^A }
 128 } Clouet, François.
 129 }
 130 }
 133^A }
 134 } Clouet of Navarre.
 288 }
 289 } Fouquet.
 304^A } Froment d'Avignon.
 311 }
 312 }
 315 } Claude Lorraine.
 316 }
 683. } French School,
 15th Century.</p> <p>734 }
 737 } Poussin.
 741 }
 995 }
 996 } Malouel.
 998 }
 1000 } French School,
 1002- } 15th Century.
 1005 }
 1005^A } Master of Moulins.
 1007 }
 1011^A }
 1012 }
 1013 }
 1014^A } French School,
 1015 } 16th Century.
 1017 }
 1024 }
 1028 }
 1036 } .</p> | <p>1048. Perréal.</p> <p>1114 }
 1115 } Albertinelli.
 1117 }
 1118 } Correggio.
 1120. Niccolò Alunno.
 1128 }
 1132 } Ansano di Pietro.
 1134. Antonello da Messina.
 1135 }
 1136 } Giorgione.
 1149 }
 1150 } Baroccio.
 1151. Bartolo di Fredi.
 1153 }
 1154 } Bartolommeo, Fra.
 1156. Bellini, Gentile.
 1157. Bellini, Gentile, School
 of.
 1158 }
 1158^A } Bellini, Giovanni.
 1167. Bianchi.
 1169. Boltraffio.
 1171. Bonifazio dei Pitati.
 1175 }
 1176 } Moretto.
 1178 }
 1179 } Bordone.
 1181 }
 1182 } Borgognone.
 1182^A }
 1184. Bronzino.
 1185. Calcar.
 1187- }
 1199 } Veronese, Paolo.
 1203. Canaletto.</p> |
|--|---|

- | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1211. Carpaccio. | 1349 } | |
| 1252 _A Catena. | 1350 } | Lotto. |
| 1259. Cima. | 1351 } | |
| 1260. Cimabue. | 1352. | Piombo, Sebastiano del. |
| 1261. Costa. | | |
| 1263 } Credi. | 1353 } | |
| 1264 } | 1354 } | |
| 1265. Leonardo da Vinci. | 1355 } | Luini. |
| 1273. Uccello. | 1359 } | |
| 1274. Florentine School. | 1360 } | |
| 1278 } Fabriano, Gentile da. | 1367 } | Mainardi. |
| 1279 } | 1367 _A } | |
| 1285. Ferrari, Defendente. | 1372. | Manni. |
| 1290 } | 1373- | |
| 1293 } Angelico, Fra. | 1376 } | Mantegna. |
| 1294 } | | |
| 1295 } | 1379. | Maratta. |
| 1296 } Botticelli. | 1381. | Marchesi. |
| 1297 } | 1383. | Simone Martini. |
| 1298. Botticelli, School of. | 1384. | Massone. |
| 1300 _A Botticelli. | 1393 } | Montagna. |
| 1300 _B Francesca, P. della. | 1394 } | |
| 1301. Gaddi, Agnolo. | 1399. | Palma Vecchio. |
| 1302. Gaddi, Taddeo. | 1400. | Palmezzano. |
| 1303. Garbo. | 1401. | Panetti. |
| 1312. Giotto. | 1414 } | |
| | 1415 } | Pesellino. |
| 1318. Girolamo dai Libri. | 1416 _A } | |
| 1319 } | 1416 _B } | Piero di Cosimo. |
| 1320 } | | |
| 1321 } Benozzo Gozzoli. | 1417. | Pinturicchio. |
| 1322 } | 1422 bis. | Pisanello. |
| 1328 } | 1435 } | |
| 1332 } | 1436 } | Francia, Fr. |
| 1333 } | 1437 } | |
| 1334 } | 1448. | Reni, Guido. |
| 1343 } | 1464 } | |
| 1344 } | 1464 bis } | Tintoretto. |
| 1345 } | 1465 } | |
| | 1467 } | |

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1482. Rosselli. | 1643A Florentine School. |
| 1496- } | 1644. Italian School. |
| 1509 } Raphael. | 1656 } |
| 1509 bis } | 1661A } Florentine School. |
| 1514- } | 1662 } |
| 1516 } Sarto, A. del. | 1663 } |
| 1516A } | 1665. Sieneſe School. |
| 1519. Savaldo. | 1668. Bologneſe School. |
| 1525 } | 1673. Venetian School. |
| 1526 } Signorelli. | 1677. Italian School. |
| 1527 } | 1677A } Ferrareſe School. |
| 1530 } | 1677B } |
| 1531 } Solario. | 1706. Herrera. |
| 1532 } | 1708 } |
| 1539 } | 1709 } |
| 1540 } Spagna, Lo. | 1710 } |
| 1547 } | 1712 } Murillo. |
| 1549 } Tiepolo. | 1713 } |
| 1553. Garofalo. | 1716 } |
| 1556 } | 1717 } |
| 1557 } Tura. | 1722 } |
| 1564 } | 1725 } Ribera. |
| 1565 } | 1731 } |
| 1566 } Perugino. | 1732 } |
| 1566A } | 1734 } Velasquez. |
| 1567 } | 1735 } |
| 1573. Perugino, School of. | 1736 } |
| 1577- } | 1738 } |
| 1581 } | 1739 } Zurburan. |
| 1583- } Titian. | 1740 } |
| 1592 } | 1911. Bril. |
| 1595 } | 1916. Brouwer. |
| 1597- } | 1917 } Brueghel, Peter the |
| 1600 } | 1917A } Elder. |
| 1602 } | 1919 } |
| 1603A } | 1920 } Brueghel, Jan the |
| | 1925 } Elder. |

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1957. | David. | 2198 | } Flemish School. | |
| 1962 | } Dyck, Anthony van. | 2202 | | |
| 1964 | | 2203 | | |
| 1967 | | 2204 _A | | |
| 1969 | | 2303 _A | Bailly. | |
| 1971- | | 2328 | } Bol. | |
| 1977 | | 2330 | | |
| 1983 | | | 2336. | Brekelenkam. |
| 1985 | | 2341- | } Cuyp, A. | |
| 1986. | Eyck, Jan van. | 2344 | | |
| 1997 | } Gossart. | 2348. | Dou. | |
| 1998 | | 2364. | Eeckhout. | |
| 1999 | | 2370 | } Victoor. | |
| 2001. | Hemessen. | 2371 | | |
| 2013 | } Jordaens. | 2372 | } Flinck. | |
| 2014 | | 2373 | | |
| 2016 | | | 2377. | Goyen. |
| 2024- | } Memling. | 2383- | } Hals, Frans. | |
| 2028 | | 2388 | | |
| 2029 | } Metsys. | 2389. | Hals, Dirck. | |
| 2030 _A | | | 2397. | Helst, B. van der. |
| 2055. | Mol. | 2401 | } Heyden, Van der. | |
| 2075 | } Rubens. | 2402 | | |
| 2077 | | 2404 | } Hobbema. | |
| 2078 | | 2404 _A | | |
| 2079 | | 2414 | } Hooch, P. de. | |
| 2082 | | 2415 | | |
| 2084- | | | 2438 bis. | Keyser. |
| 2109 | | | 2456. | Vermeer of Delft. |
| 2111 | | | 2457 | } Metsu. |
| 2112- | | | 2459 | |
| 2115 | | | 2460 | |
| 2116 | | 2462 | | |
| 2118 | | 2464 | | |
| 2157 | } Teniers. | 2466 | } Mierevelt. | |
| 2162 | | | | |
| 2196. | Weyden, R. van der. | 2467 | | |

- | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2479 | } | Moro. | 2721. | Italian School. |
| 2480 | | | 2737 | } Cologne, School of. |
| 2481 | | | 2737 _D | |
| 2497 | } | Ostade, A. van. | 2738. | Cleve, J. van. |
| 2498 | | | 2738 _A | Cleve, School of. |
| 2513. | | Ostade, I. van. | 2738 _B | Flemish School. |
| 2526- | } | Potter. | 2738 _C | } Cologne, School of. |
| 2529 | | | 2738 _D | |
| 2536- | } | Rembrandt. | 2740 | } German School. |
| 2549 | | | 2745 | |
| 2551- | | | 2745 _A | |
| 2555 | | | | |
| 2555 _A | | | N. N. Angelico, Fra. | |
| 2558 | } | Ruisdael, Jac. van. | N. N. Bellegambe. | |
| 2559 | | | N. N. Bellini, Giovanni. | |
| 2560 | | | N. N. Bruyn. | |
| 2563 _A | | Geertgen tot St. Jans. | N. N. Coter, Colin de. | |
| 2564. | | Santvoord. | N. N. Cranach. | |
| 2579 | } | Steen. | N. N. Florentine School. | |
| 2580 | | | N. N. French School. | |
| 2600. | | Velde, W. van de. | N. N. Greco, Il. | |
| 2637 | } | Wynants. | N. N. Lorenzo Monaco. | |
| 2638 | | | N. N. Mantegna. | |
| 2661 _D | | Ruysdael, Sol. van. | N. N. Master of Kinsfolk of | |
| 2703 | } | Cranach. | Virgin. | |
| 2703 _A | | | | |
| 2705 | | | | |
| 2711 _A | | Giltlinger. | N. N. Memling. | |
| 2713 | } | Holbein. | N. N. Poussin. | |
| 2714 | | | N. N. Scorel. | |
| 2715 | | | N. N. Signorelli. | |
| 2717- | | | N. N. Weyden, R. van der. | |
| 2720 | | | | |

DATE LOANED

DATE DUE

Jul 14 '30 'G

Jul 25 '30 C M

12 May 30 R M

JAN 5

NOV 13 2009

03400077

18280

708
V28F

